

# The American Historical Review

## THE STATUTE OF YORK AND THE COMMUNITY OF THE REALM

THE Statute of York marked the end of a period of revolutionary experiments in English government. For over a decade the magnates had sought to limit the king's power and to increase their own influence on the central administration. But in 1322 Edward II crushed his opponents at Boroughbridge and regained complete freedom of action. He naturally wished to remove and to denounce as utterly illegal all the restrictions which had been placed on his authority. The Statute of York was the legal expression of this policy. The chief purpose of the act was to put an end to the devices by which the barons had gained control of the central government and to make it impossible to use those devices again. This objective was clearly stated and effectively secured by the statute. The Ordinances were annulled, and no attempt was ever made to revive them. These negative clauses were the essential part of the statute in the eyes of contemporaries; it was enrolled under the title of "revocacio novarum ordinationum". But the statute also contained a positive clause, a clause which caused no particular comment at the time but which has aroused a steadily increasing amount of controversy in recent years. This clause stated what was normal, constitutional procedure, in contrast to the abnormal and revolutionary methods which were repudiated in the first part of the act. There was no particular emphasis on this statement, and it claimed to be nothing more than a reminder of past usage. Yet many modern historians feel that this clause marked an important step in the growth of representative institutions. Some have argued that the statute granted new powers to the commons.<sup>1</sup> Others, admitting that the statute made

<sup>1</sup> Rudolph Gneist, *The History of the English Constitution* (New York, 1886), II, 21; the statute "lays emphasis on the fact that where a consent to royal ordinances was to be given the *assens* of the Commons . . . must be as essential as the assent of the lords". Gaillard Lapsley, "The Commons and the Statute of York", *English Historical Review*, XXVIII (1913), 124; the statute shows "the point at which the guardianship of the great principle that the king should be under the law . . . passed from the hands of a class into

no sudden innovation, nevertheless believe that it was a formal recognition of the growing importance of the representatives of shires and boroughs.<sup>2</sup> Richardson and Sayles are almost the only modern writers who have denied the importance of the last clause of the Statute of York. They state flatly that "the purpose of the measure was to annul the hateful Ordinances and there was no ulterior purpose beyond preventing a like happening in the future. . . . The suggestion that the constitutional position of the commons was in some way thereby recognized rests upon the assumption that *la communalte du roialme* must mean the knights and burgesses . . . and for this assumption we can find no warrant."<sup>3</sup> In view of this open contradiction of a generally accepted belief it seems advisable to make a new study of the clause in question.

The historians who believe that the Statute of York recognizes the rights of the commons are unable to agree as to what these rights were. Lapsley, followed by Tout and Lefebvre, claims that the statute made the assent of the commons necessary only when "constitutional changes", such as the Ordinances, were contemplated.<sup>4</sup> According to this interpretation the statute did not apply to ordinary laws, which

---

the hands of the nation". James Conway Davies, *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II* (Cambridge, 1918), p. 515; the last clause of the Statute of York "normalized the exceptional and perpetuated what might otherwise have proved a mere temporary expedient". B. Wilkinson, *Studies in the Constitutional History of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (Manchester, 1937), p. 52; "it seems probable that the Statute of York added something to the claim of the Commons to be a necessary part of the normal parliamentary assembly".

<sup>2</sup> William Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England* (Oxford, 1896), II, 258, 369; C. H. McIlwain, "Medieval Estates", *Cambridge Medieval History*, VII (Cambridge, 1932), 678; M. V. Clarke, *Medieval Representation and Consent* (London, 1936), p. 172.

<sup>3</sup> H. G. Richardson and G. Sayles, "The Early Records of the English Parliaments", *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, VI (1928-29), 76. William A. Morris, in the introduction to *The English Government at Work*, I (Cambridge, 1940), 22, expresses some doubts as to the significance of the statute and says: "it is clear that it did not assume participation of the commons in legislation to any greater extent than that customary in the past". George Burton Adams, *Constitutional History of England* (New York, 1924), p. 199, had already said that "the constitutional importance of the Statute of York has been greatly exaggerated".

<sup>4</sup> Lapsley, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVIII, 123-24. T. F. Tout, *Place of the Reign of Edward II in English History* (Manchester, 1936), p. 136. Georges Lefebvre, *Studies and Notes Supplementary to Stubbs' Constitutional History* (with Ch. Petit-Dutaillis, Manchester, 1908-29), III, 502, expresses some hesitation in agreeing with Lapsley. Lapsley is publishing a new study of the statute in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, LVI (1941). The first section of his study appeared when this article was in proof; the second had not yet been received when it went to press. As far as can be judged at present, he is maintaining his earlier views.

could be made by the king without any reference to parliament. This explanation has not been accepted by the most recent writers on the subject. Following a suggestion by McIlwain, Haskins has argued, very ingeniously, that the whole statute was concerned with finance rather than with legislation and that the last clause merely recognized the power of the commons to consent to taxation.<sup>5</sup> This theory has not been generally accepted, and the words of the statute seem definitely connected with legislation rather than finance.<sup>6</sup> The interpretation which has the largest number of supporters was stated most clearly by Miss Clarke:

The opinions of all parties, from right to left, were converging in the same direction; in great matters, both legal and political, the final decision must rest with Parliament. Parliament must be summoned in due form by the king himself; it must include the commonalty of the realm as well as the magnates; the king must enact, but the common assent of the estates is essential to the validity of enactments. The sum of these opinions was expressed succinctly in the Statute of York. . . . The clear intention of the statute was to assert the authority of the Parliament of estates.<sup>7</sup>

McIlwain had already taken this position when he wrote that the Statute of York provided that enactments touching the estate of the whole realm must have the participation of the "representative estates".<sup>8</sup> Gneist, Davies, and Wilkinson start with different assumptions, but they all agree that the statute recognized that "the people" or "the commons" were to be consulted in matters of general concern.<sup>9</sup>

The writers who believe that the Statute of York granted new powers to the knights and burgesses are in a very weak position. They must explain away the definite statement in the last clause which says that it was merely a rehearsal of past usage. The circumstances in which the statute was made show that this was not just the usual sop to medieval conservatism. The purpose of the statute was to restore normal government, to return political activity to its old channels. Innova-

<sup>5</sup> McIlwain, *The Growth of Political Thought in the West* (New York, 1932), p. 378; George Lee Haskins, *The Statute of York* (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 99 ff.

<sup>6</sup> See below, p. 4.

<sup>7</sup> Clarke, p. 172.

<sup>8</sup> McIlwain, *Cam. Med. Hist.*, VII, 678. McIlwain later changed his views and said that the last clause referred only to the commons' power over taxation. See above, n. 5.

<sup>9</sup> Gneist, II, 20-21; Davies, p. 515; Wilkinson, pp. 52-53. Lapsley, in the introduction to D. Pasquet, *An Essay on the Origins of the House of Commons* (Cambridge, 1925), p. xi, sums up recent discussion by saying: "The Statute of York, however you interpret it, still leaves the impression that on certain occasions and for certain purposes the co-operation of the Commons in Parliament was a thing of such importance that it should be made indispensable."

tions would have been out of place in an enactment of this sort; the king's power had to be restored before he could plan reforms. Moreover, as will be shown below, the statute was quite correct in saying that it had been customary to secure the assent of the "community of the realm" to legislation in recent years. Those who argue that the statute merely recognized changes which had already taken place are on safer ground. It is undoubtedly true that representatives of shires and boroughs played a somewhat more important role in parliament after 1300 than they did before. An admission of this fact would not have been incompatible with the claim that the statute merely restored old customs. But while such an admission might have been made, there was no reason why it had to be made. The powers of the knights and burgesses were not yet so well established that they could not have been omitted in a brief description of the normal processes of government. The burden of proof is on those who claim that the Statute of York contains a definite reference to the representatives of the commons. Does the language of the last clause justify such a claim? Let us examine the passage in question.

"Mes les choses que serount a establir pur lestat de nostre seigneur le roi et de ses heirs, et pur lestat du roialme et du poeple, soient tretes, accordees, establies en parlementz par nostre seigneur le roi et par lassent des prelatz, countes et barouns et la communalte du roialme, auxint come ad este acustume cea enarere."<sup>10</sup> This might be paraphrased as: "When matters of general concern<sup>11</sup> are to be decided, they shall be discussed and determined in parliaments by the king and by the assent of the prelates, earls and barons, and the community of the realm,<sup>12</sup> as was the custom in the past."

Let us assume for a moment that the "assent of the community of

<sup>10</sup> *Statutes of the Realm*, I (London, 1810), 189.

<sup>11</sup> The technical meaning of the phrases "lestat de nostre seigneur le roi" and "lestat du roialme et du poeple" is not entirely clear, but most scholars have given them the force indicated above. Gneist, II, 21, thinks these words mean "legislation"; Wilkinson, p. 52, that they refer to "the most important affairs of the realm"; Davies, p. 515, that they mean "general legislation and administration"; Clarke, p. 172, that they refer to decisions "in great matters, both legal and political". Mellwain, *Growth of Political Thought*, p. 378, and Haskins, *Statute of York*, p. 103, paraphrase the text as "fiscal matters". Lapsley, in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, LVI, 48, suggests that it refers to "changes in the control and organization of the central government".

<sup>12</sup> There seems to be no warrant in the usage of the period for the usual translation of "communalte" as "commonalty". The Latin equivalent, "communitas", ordinarily means "community" or even "association". Moreover, the French word is used in the plural, e.g., *Rotuli parliamentorum* (London, 1767-77), I, 451, "le communaltez de tuz les countez du roialme". Here the only translation which makes sense is "communities".



the realm" does not mean the assent of the representatives of shires and boroughs. That this is not an entirely unjustifiable hypothesis will be shown below. Once this assumption has been made, it is evident that there is nothing very new in the last clause of the Statute of York. It is a description of the normal functioning of government at any time in the preceding twenty years. Ever since the reign of Henry III it had been customary to make important decisions in parliament. Exceptions to this rule, not uncommon at first, had become increasingly rare since 1295. The most important legal decisions had regularly been made in parliament since the beginning of Edward I's reign. During the same reign there was a tendency to treat important legislation in parliament and to secure grants of general taxation in the same place. These tendencies became even stronger in the reign of Edward II. By 1322 everyone could agree that it was customary and desirable to make important decisions in parliament.

But an admission that important acts should be done *in* parliament is not an admission that they must be ratified by everyone present *at* parliament. As Lapsley has well said, parliament was "a place and occasion rather than a constitutional body".<sup>13</sup> This is quite evident in the work of parliament as a law court. Many lawsuits were decided in parliament, but the decision was usually made by a small group of royal officials and magnates.<sup>14</sup> The whole group of magnates was not consulted about these decisions, much less the representatives of shires and boroughs. There is no reason to assume that everyone present *at* parliament took part in all the work of government *in* parliament. Many acts of parliament represented only the decisions of the king and his officials.

Why was it necessary to do these things *in* parliament when most of those present *at* parliament had no influence on them and usually no interest in them? A complete answer to this question would involve a detailed examination of parliamentary origins which would be out of place in this study. It may be suggested, however, that one of the chief reasons for the growth of parliamentary institutions in thirteenth century Europe was that lay rulers found it necessary to secure publicity for their acts. The men of the Middle Ages had a horror of secret transactions, a feeling that is perfectly understandable in a period when people depended on public acts and oral tradition for their rights and

<sup>13</sup> *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIV (1919), 27.

<sup>14</sup> Richardson and Sayles, "The Early Records of the English Parliaments", *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, V (1927-28), 129 ff., VI, 71 ff., 129 ff.

possessions. When the king was primarily a feudal lord, he could run his ordinary affairs like any other private person. Sufficient publicity was secured if he accomplished his acts in the presence of his household and a few vassals. But when the king became primarily a sovereign, ruling his subjects directly instead of through a feudal hierarchy, more of his acts were of a public nature, more frequent public assemblies were necessary, and a larger number of people had to be called in. A king claiming to be direct ruler of all the people was bound to let all the people know of his acts. As a matter of practical politics it was often advisable to let them know the reasons for these acts. The king and his ministers had to explain and justify their policy, especially when it was a policy which would cost the country money. Thus, during the reigns of Henry III and Edward I an increasingly large number of affairs were treated in parliament, and an increasingly large number of people were called to hear them discussed.

Following this interpretation, representatives of the shires and the towns were summoned primarily to hear descriptions and explanations of royal policy.<sup>15</sup> Parliament, for the lower orders at least, was first and foremost an agency of propaganda.<sup>16</sup> It is easy for us to underestimate the effectiveness of the speeches which were delivered at the formal

<sup>15</sup> I am not unaware of the fact that the first large groups of representatives summoned before the king came to give information rather than to hear explanations of royal policy. See Albert Beebe White, "Some Early Instances of Concentration of Representatives in England", *American Historical Review*, XIX (1913-14), 735-50. But this function became less important after 1250, and it is difficult to find any clear example of the knights and burgesses giving information to the king in the reigns of the first two Edwards. Even in the earlier period it seems possible that the representatives were brought together not only to give information but also to be convinced of the good intentions of the government. In 1227, for example, it would have been easier to follow the precedent of Henry II and send out commissioners to receive complaints against the sheriffs rather than to summon representatives to present the complaints to the king. However, by concentrating representatives before him Henry III was able to impress the country with his desire to observe the charters.

<sup>16</sup> Stubbs, ed., *Select Charters* (Oxford, 1921), p. 395; sheriffs in 1261 are ordered to send three knights from each county "nobiscum super praemissis colloquium habituros, ut ipsi per effectum operis videant et intelligant quod nihil attemptare proponimus nisi quod honori et communi utilitati regni nostri noverimus convenire". This is an early example of the use of representatives to spread royal ideas. See Lapsley's remarks on "the plan of moulding public opinion through elected representatives, to whom the case for the crown could be put *viva voce*" in his introduction to Pasquet, p. xi. See also H. M. Cam, "The Relation of English Members of Parliament to their Constituencies", in *L'organisation corporative du moyen âge à la fin de l'ancien régime* (Université de Louvain, Recueil de travaux publiés par les membres des Conférences d'histoire et de philologie, 2<sup>e</sup> série, fasc. 50, 1939), p. 147: "Edward I . . . made use of the representative system for propaganda purposes, demonstrating to the communities of shires and boroughs . . . the justice of his own cause".

sessions. We should remember that these people were accustomed to respond to the spoken rather than the written word, that these speeches gave them their only authentic information about the plans of the government, and that even the knights would be impressed by the presence of the king and the greatest men of the realm. In these circumstances almost any speech would be remembered, and a good speech would make a tremendous impression. Knights and burgesses would repeat what they had heard to their friends and neighbors, and thus public opinion would be brought to favor or at least to acquiesce in royal policy. This preparation of public opinion was especially necessary when taxes were to be levied, and it may well be true that taxation was the chief reason for summoning representatives of shires and towns to parliament.<sup>17</sup> I would suggest, however, that the most important thing was not to obtain consent from the representatives but rather to explain the necessity for taxation to them. Actual consent could have been, and occasionally was, obtained elsewhere, in regional or local assemblies, but public opinion could be moved much more effectively in parliament.<sup>18</sup>

Be this as it may, the function of parliament in the reign of Edward II was primarily that of securing publicity for acts of government. As Lapsley has said, it "was an excellent place and a suitable occasion for registering acts or statutes which were intended to be permanent, for creating or influencing public opinion, for transacting, in short, any business that required to be done publicly and solemnly, or for which

<sup>17</sup> J. G. Edwards, "The *Plena Potestas* of English Parliamentary Representatives", in *Oxford Essays in Medieval History presented to Herbert Edward Salter* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 146 ff. Edwards's emphasis on the *plena potestas* clause as proof of the right of the commons to consent to taxation is probably unjustified. Professor Gaines Post, of the University of Wisconsin, placed the discussion of this clause on a new footing by his paper read at the 1940 meeting of the American Historical Association. He showed that the *plena potestas* clause was regularly included in commissions of proctors and attorneys who represented individuals and communities in law courts and that far from giving proctors a right of consent it bound them in advance to accept the decisions of the court before which they appeared. It was only natural for the English government to desire that representatives who appeared before the high court of parliament be accredited according to the usual form. The government, however, does not seem to have used the clause to force the representatives to accept taxation. See the following note for remarks about its use in France.

<sup>18</sup> As Taylor has shown, in France representatives from the whole country were concentrated to hear government officials explain the need for new taxes, but the actual grants of taxes were made in local assemblies or by local authorities. In connection with Edwards's argument that the grant of full powers to English representatives was required because the government wished them to have authority to grant taxes, it is interesting to note that the French representatives, who granted no taxes, also had full powers. See Joseph R. Strayer and Charles H. Taylor, *Studies in Early French Taxation* (Cambridge, 1939), pp. 113 ff., 144 ff.

the country had to be prepared by means of preliminary statements".<sup>19</sup> If the existence of parliament limited the executive and legislative powers of the king, it did so only because it required publicity and explanations for some of his acts. The initiative remained with the king, and most of the decisions were made by the king or his ministers.<sup>20</sup> It is possible that some officials, especially those of the household, were annoyed because the custom of making important decisions in parliament prevented swift, secret action. The Ordainers seem to have felt that in the first years of Edward's reign there had been a deliberate policy of acting outside of parliament and of holding parliaments less frequently than was customary.<sup>21</sup> They, of course, went to the other extreme. Their initiative was substituted for that of the king in proposing measures to the assembly, and they insisted that many administrative acts, which had never before been referred to parliament, take place there.<sup>22</sup> The Statute of York rejected both these extreme points of view and merely asked for the observance of custom. The initiative in policy and lawmaking was restored to the king, and only matters of public concern were to be treated in parliament. The right of the king to run his own affairs and to name his own officials was not to be questioned. On the other hand, there was a promise that matters of public interest would be discussed in parliament, as was customary. Edward and his advisers were not going to abuse their victory. They wished to restore the normal machinery of government and to allow parliament to function as it had in the past. This is all that is promised in the last clause of the Statute of York.

Now let us consider the words which are supposed to have recognized the increased importance of the commons. Acts done in parliament are initiated by the king, but they require the assent of the prelates, earls and barons, and the community of the realm. Let us be careful not to overemphasize the force of the word "assent". At this time it means little more than "acquiesce" or "acknowledge". A great scholar, John of Paris, can solemnly maintain that bishops are elected with the "assent" of the people<sup>23</sup>—this at a time when even the memory of popular participation in episcopal elections has almost vanished. Assent in parliament is usually a mere formality, for few measures are proposed in

<sup>19</sup> *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIV, 27.

<sup>20</sup> Haskins, "The King's High Court of Parliament", *History*, XXIV (1939-40), 305: "it is the council, with the king as presiding officer, which is the heart and core of the medieval parliament".

<sup>21</sup> *Statutes of the Realm*, I, 165, art. 29.      <sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 158 ff., arts. 7, 9, 14, 15, 16.

<sup>23</sup> Melchior Goldast, *Monarchia* (Hanover and Frankfurt, 1611-14), II, 120.

parliament until all opposition has been conciliated or overridden. This is not to deny that the magnates who attend parliament have a very real influence on the policies and acts of the government, but that influence is exerted outside of parliament, in private conversations or in council. Once the balance of agreement or power has been struck, it will be registered in parliament. Any person or group with sufficient power can secure assent to their acts in parliament. Lancaster's acts against Edward, Edward's acts against Lancaster, the exile of the Despensers, the punishment of the Despensers' enemies are all ratified in parliament.

Yet the need for obtaining assent in parliament, even though it is usually a mere formality, has its importance. It makes parliament a necessary part of the machinery of government; it creates the precedents which eventually enable parliament to become the most important part of the machinery of government. And if, in 1322, the assent of the knights and burgesses is a necessary formality in the enactment of legislation, then we can be sure that they have a definite and significant place in the government, that they are organized and act as estates, that they have been recognized as a force to be conciliated. This is true even if the assent is a mere acknowledgment that the statute has been read in their presence. But, except for the words of the Statute of York, there is very little to support the assumption that the knights and burgesses have fully attained this position by 1322. And the words of the Statute of York itself are not very explicit. Does "*la communalte du roialme*" mean the knights and burgesses, or is it merely a redundant expression, in apposition with "*prelatz, countes et barouns*"?<sup>24</sup>

We should note, in the first place, that the chancery was perfectly capable of using unnecessary expressions. The precision of chancery language has been somewhat overrated; demands of style and rhythm often led to the insertion of unnecessary words. A comparison of petitions with the writs based on them will show how simple matter-of-fact statements were elaborated as they passed through the hands of the king's clerks. It was customary for the chancery to end an enumeration with a vague general phrase. In the earlier period it would list witnesses and close by saying that many others were present. In the fourteenth century it will speak of "*prelates, earls, barons, and other great men*,"<sup>25</sup> of "*archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, and other prelates*,"<sup>26</sup> of "*earls,*

<sup>24</sup> Lefebvre, III, 501, admits this latter possibility in spite of his tendency to accept Lapsley's interpretation.

<sup>25</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, I, 343 (1315).      <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 456 (1321).

barons, magnates, *proceres*, and other nobles".<sup>27</sup> There is nothing in chancery style which makes it necessary to assume that "the community of the realm" and "prelates, earls, and barons" are different groups.

Historically there is every reason to suppose that the magnates were considered representatives of, and spokesmen for, the community of the realm. They first appear in this role in article 61 of Magna Carta, where the Twenty-five and the "*communa totius terre*" are given power to distrain the king. It is clear from the context that the community here referred to is that of the magnates and their feudal dependents.<sup>28</sup> During the long struggle between Henry III and his barons, which filled the middle years of the thirteenth century, the magnates constantly claimed to represent the interests of the community of the realm.<sup>29</sup> Thus the oath which the barons took at Oxford was called the oath of "*le commun de Engleterre*".<sup>30</sup> The Twelve who were elected by the barons to meet with the council in parliament were to act "*pur tut le commun de la terre*", and the peace of 1264 was made by the unanimous assent of the prelates, earls, barons, and "*communitatis regni*".<sup>31</sup> It is probably true that on these occasions many lesser landowners were associated with the magnates, but it is also true that the magnates were the dominant element in the revolutionary group. They alone could speak for the community of the realm; when lesser men put forward a program, they called themselves the "*communitas bachelorie Anglie*".<sup>32</sup> In the troubles of 1297 the rebellious barons again spoke for

<sup>27</sup> *Statutes of the Realm*, I, 151.

<sup>28</sup> William Sharp McKechnie, *Magna Carta* (Glasgow, 1914), p. 472, says that the phrase could mean at most only the feudal tenants and perhaps only the magnates.

<sup>29</sup> J. E. A. Jolliffe, *The Constitutional History of Medieval England* (London, 1937), p. 262, says that when the barons speak of the community of the realm, "their view is essentially one of a community of tenures. . . . This baronial conception of *communitas*, and the sense of their own quality as its natural representative inspires the baronage to act as a national opposition in the thirteenth century." See also his remarks, p. 287, about the growth of "the more modern notion of the assembly of the barons as an institution of the community rather than of the crown, whose affinities are with the *universitas regni* or body of tenants in chief, for which it acts as representative".

<sup>30</sup> Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 379. This oath is almost that of a commune and could have been taken only by a relatively small group of men who were closely bound together by status and interests.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 381, 400. Other examples of the use of this phrase are discussed in R. F. Treharne, *The Baronial Plan of Reform* (Manchester, 1932), pp. 67, 83-89, 118, 180, 185. Treharne thinks that the whole body of tenants in chief was included in the "*communitas regni*", but he admits that the greater barons spoke for the group.

<sup>32</sup> *Annales monasterii de Burton*, in Rolls Series, XXXVI, Part 1 (London, 1864), 471. The composition of this group is discussed by Treharne, pp. 160-64. It seems clear that it included many landholders of considerable local importance.

the community of the realm; Rishanger relates how "nuncii ex parte comitum" laid before the king the grievances of the prelates, earls, barons, "et tota terrae communitas".<sup>33</sup>

The use of this phrase by the magnates can be explained by conditions in thirteenth century England. By the reign of Henry III it was evident that a mere assertion of individual feudal rights was not enough to guard the magnates against the encroachments of the central government or to give them the power and authority which they desired. To gain their ends it was necessary for them to act as a group which would influence or control the central government. This was a political necessity, but it could hardly be justified by purely feudal arguments. The magnates had to find a moral basis for their claims, and they did so by appealing to the new idea of the "communitas regni".<sup>34</sup> If England was to be conceived of as a community with rights and interests distinct from those of the pope, the king, or any other individual, then there must be some group which could preserve the rights and speak for the interests of the community. The magnates claimed that this was their function, that they were the natural guardians of the welfare of the realm. Thus when the king violated custom, made foolish decisions, or placed undue burdens on his subjects, the barons and prelates had the right to protest in the name of all. Naturally they made these protests only when they themselves were aggrieved, but they did not limit their complaints to their own grievances.<sup>35</sup> Thus it is easy to see how the magnates became spokesmen for the community of the realm. No other group could have filled this role, for it is doubtful if many other men

<sup>33</sup> *Willelmi Rishanger Chronica*, in Rolls Series, XXVIII, Part II (London, 1865), 175-76.

<sup>34</sup> Frederick Maurice Powicke, "England and Europe in the Thirteenth Century", Harvard Tercentenary Publications, *Independence, Convergence, and Borrowing* (Cambridge, 1937), pp. 142-43, says that in the reign of Henry III "King, magnates, judges, knights had now one common concern . . . they came to look upon England as a whole and were conscious of some form of general will which could be expressed by the whole body of responsible men summoned together to discuss the affairs of the realm—the body described as the 'communitas regni' ". This interpretation makes the "communitas" somewhat more of a national body and ascribes less importance to baronial revolt than mine, but even if it is accepted, it remains true that the most powerful element in the "body of responsible men" summoned to discuss the affairs of the realm would be the barons. See also White, "Was There a 'Common Council' before Parliament?", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXV (1919-20), 11: "During the twelve-forties especially, writings, both chronicle and official, were becoming suddenly filled with every possible use and combination of *communis* and *communitas*, and the idea these words carried were ideas to conjure with in those days."

<sup>35</sup> This is evident in the lists of grievances which they gave the king in 1258 and 1297, as recorded in the *Annals of Burton*, pp. 439-43, and Rishanger, pp. 175-76.



felt at that time that they were part of a nation-wide political community. The idea that there could be such communities was a rather new one in the thirteenth century, and it was grasped by the clergy and barons long before it was understood by other classes.<sup>36</sup>

The magnates first claimed to be speaking for the community of the realm when they were opposing or rebelling against the king. But by the end of Henry III's reign the king had accepted the idea and was using the phrase to describe baronial support of his plans. Thus when Henry III was excusing himself in 1270 for not going on the crusade, he said that it had seemed inexpedient to "praelatis, magnatibus et communitati regni nostri" for both the king and his eldest son to be absent at the same time.<sup>37</sup> Edward I used the phrase in the same way. The customs of 1275 were granted by the magnates at the request of the merchants, but one official document says that they were conceded by the "communitas regni".<sup>38</sup> Edward also claimed that the Welsh war of 1282 was begun "de consilio procerum et magnatum regni nostri necnon et totius communitatis ejusdem".<sup>39</sup> In 1290 he announced that certain bishops and barons had granted an aid to marry the king's daughter "pro se et communitate totius regni quantum in ipsis est".<sup>40</sup> Royal clerks also accepted the baronial claim and enrolled under the headings "communitas Anglie" or "communitas regni" petitions which were drawn up by the magnates and dealt primarily with their interests.<sup>41</sup> Some of these petitions may also have had the support of the knights and burgesses, but this was not true in all cases. No one will

<sup>36</sup> The whole question of the development of politically conscious groups on a large scale in medieval states is still very obscure. It is being attacked by the Commission internationale pour l'histoire des assemblées d'états, which has already achieved some notable results. Especially important for the subject of this paper are the following studies: É. Lousse, "Les caractères essentiels de l'état corporatif médiéval", and Georges de Lagarde, "L'idée de représentation dans les œuvres de Guillaume d'Ockham", both in "Histoire des assemblées d'états", *Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Sciences*, IX (1937); Lousse, "La formation des ordres dans la société médiévale", in *L'organisation corporative du moyen âge à la fin de l'ancien régime* (Université de Louvain, Recueil de travaux publiés par les membres des Conférences d'histoire et de philologie, 2<sup>e</sup> série, fasc. 44, 1937); De Lagarde, "La structure politique et sociale de l'Europe au xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle", in fasc. 50 of the same series.

<sup>37</sup> T. Rymer, *Foedera* (London, 1704-35), I, 864.

<sup>38</sup> *Parliamentary Writs* (London, 1827-34), I, 1, 2, nos. 2, 3, 7, 10. See Jolliffe's discussion, p. 399.

<sup>39</sup> *Parl. Writs*, I, 10. The commons were not summoned in that year.

<sup>40</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, I, 25.

<sup>41</sup> These petitions are discussed by Haskins, "Three Early Petitions of the Commons", *Speculum*, XII (1937), 315-18; Richardson and Sayles, *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, VI, 77, IX (1931-32), 7-9; Howard L. Gray, *The Influence of the Commons on Early Legislation* (Cambridge, 1932), p. 201.



argue that in the reign of Edward I the "community of the realm" meant the representatives of the commons.<sup>42</sup>

The claim is made, however, that under Edward II the meaning of the term shifted. It is said that the magnates ceased to be considered spokesmen for the community of the realm and that the knights and burgesses acquired a monopoly of this function. When, therefore, the Statute of York required the assent of the community of the realm to certain acts, it meant that the representatives of the commons had to be consulted on these occasions. Let us examine the way in which the term was used in the first fifteen years of the reign of Edward II and see if this contention is justified.

The most impressive evidence is from parliamentary petitions. Generally speaking, until 1307 petitions in the name of the community of the realm are the work of the magnates, or at least of groups in which the magnates played the leading part. After 1307 this is no longer true. Other men, especially those belonging to the merchant class, try to make their requests seem more urgent and important by presenting them in the name of the community of the realm. But, as Richardson and Sayles have pointed out, many of these petitions come from people who have no claim to be representatives of the whole community.<sup>43</sup> They deal with affairs which interest only small groups, and it seems unlikely that they are the work of the whole body of knights and burgesses or even of representatives of individual constituencies. For example, the "community of the land" complain that toll for crossing the Humber near Barton has been doubled;<sup>44</sup> the "community of the realm" ask that certain forms be observed when they account in the wardrobe;<sup>45</sup> the "community of the land and especially those of the east of London" ask that certain roads and bridges be repaired;<sup>46</sup> "certain men of the realm, petitioning for themselves and the community of the realm" ask for the extension of the Statute of Fines.<sup>47</sup>

Admitting, for the sake of argument, that individual knights and burgesses might use this form of petition, it still is not true that they are the only ones to do so. The magnates still speak for the community of the realm, and their right to do so is never questioned. Thus the

<sup>42</sup> This is admitted by Gray, p. 201, and by Clarke, p. 171, both of whom argue strongly that under Edward II the community of the realm did mean the commons.

<sup>43</sup> *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, IX, 9. <sup>44</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, I, 291 (1315).

<sup>45</sup> Henry Cole, ed., *Documents Illustrative of English History in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (London, 1844), p. 27. On page 42 this same petition is entered as a petition of "aliquorum qui habent computare in Garderoba Regis" (1318).

<sup>46</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, I, 308 (1315). <sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 295 (1315).

barons write a letter to the pope in 1309 in the name of the community of the realm.<sup>48</sup> In 1312 the earls of Pembroke and Hereford protest in the name of the magnates and “toute la communalte du roiaume” against Langton’s appointment as treasurer, because it violates the Ordinances.<sup>49</sup> The magnates hand in petitions in the name of “prelatz, contes, et barons et tute la communalte du roiaume”;<sup>50</sup> or in the name of “ercesques, evesques, prelatz, counts, et barons et autre gentz de la communaltee d’Engleterre, que tenent lour manoirs en cheif de nostre seignor”.<sup>51</sup> It is evident that the magnates still think of themselves as the spokesmen for the community of the land and that they believe that their interests are those of the community. They are not the only ones to think so. On several occasions a petition from the magnates alone is described by a royal clerk as a petition of the community of the realm. Richardson and Sayles have pointed out that a petition of 1314 from the bishops and barons, asking the council to limit the price of meat, is called in the writ which answers it a petition of the “archie-piscoporum, episcoporum, comitum, baronum et aliorum de communitate regni nostri”.<sup>52</sup> Another example is the answer to a petition of the magnates asking that they be allowed to have immediate possession of fines, amercements, and chattels of their felons without the intervention of the exchequer. The answer runs: “Responsum est in communi in quadam petitione exhibita coram rege et consilio que continet materiam istius petitionis et plures alios articulos tangentes communitatem regni.”<sup>53</sup> This is probably a reference to a petition of the bishop of Ely in 1318 asking for this and other rights. In answering this petition the king’s legal advisers had suggested that the privilege of immediate possession of the chattels of felons be extended to all magnates, and the king and council had agreed.<sup>54</sup> In any case, the “community of the realm” interested in forfeitures of felons could be only the community of magnates.

<sup>48</sup> Davies, p. 513.      <sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix, p. 551.

<sup>50</sup> Cole, p. 6. In the body of the petition the request runs “prie le barnage od la communalte de people”; p. 7, a petition from “le barnage od le commun poeple”.

<sup>51</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, I, 416.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 295. Gray, p. 208, thinks the writ is correct in assuming participation of the commons but does not explain why they were not named in the petition.

<sup>53</sup> Gray, p. 203. Gray assumes that this refers to a petition of the commons and that it proves that such petitions were considered first because they were more important.

<sup>54</sup> Richardson and Sayles, *Rotuli parliamentorum Anglie hactenus inediti*, Camden Society (London, 1935), p. 68. The other articles were the right to use privileges in charters which might have lapsed from disuse and the right to have a coroner. It is possible that there was another petition touching forfeitures of felons before the council at this time, since the legal advisers say, “et de ce fut mis avant peticion en parlement ore depart le poeple”. But this may refer only to the general petition of the magnates, which might have come in before the bishop’s petition was answered.

After ruling out petitions in the name of the community of the realm which are the work of either a small number of private persons or of the magnates, we are left with some petitions which might have been handed in by the whole group of knights and burgesses. They deal with grievances which concerned the whole country and resemble in some respects the long petitions of the commons which become frequent in the next reign.<sup>55</sup> It would prove very little if it were established that all these petitions were sent in by the commons, since we have already seen that many groups covered themselves with the name of the "community of the realm" and that the knights and burgesses had no monopoly of the appellation. But it is very doubtful that all these petitions came from the group of representatives in parliament. We have one petition which states that it comes from the knights, citizens, and burgesses in behalf of the counties, cities, and towns.<sup>56</sup> If the commons were so specific in describing themselves one time, how can we assume that they were content with the vague "community of the realm" at other times? Again, in the long petition of 1309 to the king from "la communalte de son roialme" there is a special article on the grievance of "les chavaliers, gentz de citez e de burghs et d'autres villes" who found no one to receive their petitions.<sup>57</sup> If the knights and burgesses were the "community of the realm", why did they have to give a new description of themselves when it came to this grievance? Finally we should notice that in the Ordinances, unquestionably drawn up by the barons alone, we find mentioned many of the grievances brought forward in petitions of the community of the realm. Thus abuse of prises, the new customs, insufficient sheriffs, holding of pleas by the steward and marshal, too easy granting of the king's peace, and abuse of letters of protection are all condemned by the Ordinances and are all petitioned against at one time or another by the "community of the realm".<sup>58</sup> This

<sup>55</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, I, 289, 290, 372, 430, 443; Cole, p. 6. These are discussed by Gray, pp. 202 ff., and by Richardson and Sayles, *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, VI, 77, IX, 8-9.

<sup>56</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, I, 371, "quedam peticio per milites, cives, et burgenses pro comitatibus, civitatibus et burgis regni" (1320).

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 443.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 324, 443-44; Cole, p. 6. Compare these with articles 10, 11, 17, 26, 28, and 29 of the Ordinances. Another interesting case is that of the petition printed by Davies, p. 582, in which "la communalte dengleterre" asks that no sheriffs be appointed who are officials or pensioners of great lords (dated by Davies 1316-22). It would seem that the magnates could not have been interested in such a petition, yet the Statute of Sheriffs, 1316 (*Statutes of the Realm*, I, 174), which forbids the appointment of sheriffs who are officials of great lords, was made "par demonstraunce des Prelatz, Contes, Barons, et autres grantz du Roiaume . . . et par grevous pleintes del poeple", and the enacting clause mentions only the assent of the magnates. Thus some, at least, of the magnates had joined in the complaint.

is not conclusive proof that the magnates were responsible for all such petitions, but it does show that they were interested in these matters and that they might well have joined in petitions concerning them. It seems impossible to establish that during the reign of Edward II any petition in the name of the community of the realm was exclusively the work of the knights and burgesses.<sup>59</sup>

The evidence from petitions should not be given too much weight. The wording of petitions usually represented the views of private persons, and the notes written in answer to them were often informal and unofficial. Let us turn to official pronouncements of the government. When we do this, a striking divergence is at once noticeable. When the government is ordering the collection of a subsidy, it is always careful to specify that it was granted with the consent of the "*communitates comitatum regni nostri*" and the "*cives et burgenses civitatum et burgorum regni*".<sup>60</sup> But when a statute has been made, we find only the assent of the magnates and "*la communalte de nostre roialme*" or, in a few cases, the assent of the magnates alone.<sup>61</sup> In other

<sup>59</sup> Gray, pp. 201-14, argues strongly against this point of view. He proves that the magnates were not responsible for all petitions in the name of the community of the realm during the reign of Edward II, but he does not prove (1) that the magnates were not responsible for some of these petitions or (2) that the knights and burgesses were exclusively responsible for any of them. His chief argument on the second point is the resemblance between some of these petitions and the commons' petitions of the reign of Edward III (though he admits that they were not treated in exactly the same way). But the commons' petition must have developed very slowly, and a period of transition, such as the reign of Edward II, was needed between the time when petitions for the community were primarily the work of the magnates and that when they were exclusively the work of the commons. The situation was very different after 1327, when the knights were closely associated with the burgesses and when petitions from private persons began to decline rapidly. In these circumstances general petitions would always come from the knights and burgesses, who would soon feel that they alone spoke for the community. Prior to 1327 the knights were often associated with the magnates (see below, p. 000), and hundreds of people were sending in petitions every year. Thus the "community of the realm" was a vague phrase which could be used by almost any group in petitions, though government officials, with their usual conservatism, still tended to apply it to groups of which the magnates were a part.

<sup>60</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, I, 442 (1307), 448 (1313), 454 (1319), 457 (1322). The same distinction was usually made in the latter years of Edward I. See *ibid.*, p. 227 (1295), and *Parl. Writs*, I, 178 (1306). Note the use of the plural "*communitates*" to describe the groups represented by the knights and the burgesses. They speak for their local districts, not for the realm as a whole.

<sup>61</sup> *Statutes of the Realm*, I, 169, 170, 177, 179, 180, 185; *Rot. Parl.*, I, 456. The exceptional cases, in which the community of the realm is not mentioned, are *Statutes of the Realm*, I, 174 (1316) and 195 (1324). In the last year of the reign of Edward I the Statute of Carlisle (*ibid.*, pp. 151, 152) speaks of the assent of the *communities* of the realm, just as a writ on taxes would do. This statute was made in exceptional circum-

words, in the case in which we know that it was advisable to obtain the consent of the knights and burgesses they are specifically mentioned. In the case in which we suspect that their assent was not necessary, knights and burgesses drop out of the enacting clause, and only the indefinite "community of the realm" (and not always that) is left. When the commons are performing their most important function and exercising their most definite privilege, they are not called the "community of the realm".<sup>62</sup> This makes it very doubtful that they are ever designated by this phrase.

We can go even further. In the writs ordering the levy of taxes the "community of the realm" is frequently mentioned after the specific grantors have been named. But it is always mentioned in connection with the earls and barons or the earls, barons, and knights, never in connection with the burgesses. Thus in 1306 the magnates and knights grant a thirtieth "*pro se et tota communitate regni*", while the town representatives grant a twentieth.<sup>63</sup> In 1309 the earls, barons, knights, freemen, "*ac tota communitas regni nostri*" grant a twenty-fifth.<sup>64</sup> In 1315 the "*magnates et communitas regni*" grant the king one armed man from each vill, while the "*cives, burgenses, et milites de comitatibus*" grant a fifteenth.<sup>65</sup> We should not make too much of this last grouping, even though it is repeated in a later writ, for in other writs the knights are associated with the magnates in the grant of soldiers.<sup>66</sup> But we can say definitely that in grants of aids the "*communitas regni*" always includes the earls and barons while it never includes the bur-

---

stances, and it is possible that the knights, at least, were consulted in order to give an appearance of national solidarity in a struggle with the church. This unusual formula is not repeated. Another unusual form is found in the repeal of the pardon granted to the enemies of the Despensers (*ibid.*, pp. 187-88), in which the enacting clause mentions the assent of the "*prelatz, countes, barons, chivalers des counteez et la commune du roialme*". This act exposed some very powerful men to prosecution, and the king may have felt it advisable to gain the support of the knights and perhaps of the burgesses, although, given the usages of the period, it is very doubtful that "*la commune du roialme*" refers to the burgesses here (see nn. 62-67). I should take it to be a phrase which sums up the groups already mentioned. In any case, "*la commune du roialme*" does not refer to both knights and burgesses; it is not an equivalent of "commons".

<sup>62</sup> Ludwig Riess, *The History of the English Electoral Law in the Middle Ages* (trans. by K. L. Wood-Legh, Cambridge, 1940), pp. 12, 13, points out that in the crisis of 1297 the barons specifically requested that the right of the knights and burgesses to assent to taxation be recognized and that Edward I, in weakening their program as far as he dared, substituted the "community of the realm" for the specific reference to knights and burgesses. A promise to the "community of the realm" did not bind him to secure the assent of knights and burgesses. Jolliffe, p. 357, expresses much the same view.

<sup>63</sup> Pasquet, Appendix, pp. 235-36.

<sup>64</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, I, 445.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 351, 450.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 451.

gesses. It is a vague and unnecessary expression, but its meaning can never be stretched widely enough to include all the commons.<sup>67</sup>

In statutes and other legislative acts we find, as was said above, that the clause expressing advice or assent regularly mentions the prelates, earls, barons, and the community of the realm. Thus "ercesques, evesques, abbes, priours, countes, barons et la communalte de nostre roialme" agree that no one is to be sued for the death of Piers Gaveston. In 1314 "les prelatz, contes, barons, et la communalte de nostre roiaume" decide that the king can forbid men to come armed to parliament. The statute made at York in 1318 is made "par assent des prelatz, countes, barons et la comunaute de son roiaume".<sup>68</sup> A slight variant occurs in the Statute of Westminster IV, made "par assent des prelatz, countes et barouns et tote la commune de son roialme".<sup>69</sup> Thus the last sentence of the Statute of York contains the exact words of the enacting clause of most legislation of the reign of Edward II. The fact that it uses this language shows that it is describing primarily legislative activity. And the precedents just noted show that the authors of the sentence were quite right when they said that it described what was customary.

But does "la communalte du roiaume" mean the commons when applied to legislative activity? The fact that the phrase does not mean the commons in other connections creates a strong presumption that it does not mean the commons here. In petitions the "community of the realm" may refer to the magnates alone, to the magnates and their supporters, or to indefinite and unorganized groups of private persons. In grants of subsidies the earls, barons, and knights speak for the "community of the realm". How can we assume that in legislation, and in legislation alone, the "community of the realm" means the knights and burgesses?

<sup>67</sup> There is some evidence to show that the knights, profiting by their association with the magnates, were recognized as having some right to speak for the "community of the land" during the crisis of 1327, while the burgesses were still considered only representatives of the local interests of their towns. Clarke, p. 194, the *Pipewell Chronicle*, describing the delegation sent to depose Edward II, says that it included "quatre chivalers pur la communalte de la terre". Richardson and Sayles, *Rot. Parl.*, p. 125, "la commune" asks that answers to its petition be given to the knights but says nothing of the burgesses. Perhaps there is a faint echo of this distinction in a poem (ca. 1400) quoted by Cam, p. 155, in which the "knyghtis of the comunete" are distinguished from the "citiseyns" in parliament. This is what might be expected from the social structure of England. The knights could associate with the magnates and join them in speaking for the community. By the early years of the reign of Edward III they were independent enough to act alone. The burgesses, more interested in local affairs, were recognized much more slowly as representatives of the whole community.

<sup>68</sup> *Statutes of the Realm*, I, 169, 170, 177.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 180 (1320).

If we knew more of the ideas and purposes of the men who drew up the coronation oath of 1308,<sup>70</sup> we might find it easier to interpret references to the "community of the realm" in the legislation of Edward's reign. When they made the king promise to observe "les leys et les custumes droitureles les quiels la communaute de vostre roiaume aura esleu",<sup>71</sup> were they merely thinking of the customs and the statutes which had already been ratified by common usage?<sup>72</sup> In that case the "community of the realm" of the coronation oath has no connection with parliament, since English law as it existed in 1308 was largely non-parliamentary in origin. The phrase would refer primarily to the magnates, whose acceptance of legal innovations had usually been decisive. Or was the emphasis meant to fall on future legislation, and was the king promising to accept the "future decisions of the common council", that is, normally, of parliament?<sup>73</sup> Though this interpretation is supported by the high authority of Richardson and Sayles, it seems somewhat exaggerated. Neither Edward nor his successors felt bound to accept all the decisions of parliament. They could reject, modify, or suspend parliamentary legislation without being accused of violating their coronation oath. But even if this extreme view be adopted, it still does not make the "community of the realm" a synonym for the commons. Approval by the magnates was essential for parliamentary legislation, while it was not until late in the fourteenth century that approval by the commons became necessary in all cases. It seems safe to say that a king who promised in 1308 to accept the future decisions of the com-

<sup>70</sup> The most recent discussions of the oath may be found in Wilkinson, "The Coronation Oath of Edward II", *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait* (Manchester, 1933), pp. 405 ff.; Richardson and Sayles, "Early Coronation Records", *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, XIII (1935-36), 139 ff., XIV (1936-37), 1 ff., 195 ff.; Percy Ernst Schramm, *A History of the English Coronation* (Oxford, 1937), pp. 203 ff., and "Ordines-Studien, III: Die Krönung in England", *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, XV (1938), 339 ff.; Richardson, "The English Coronation Oath", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fourth Series, XXIII (1941), 129 ff.

<sup>71</sup> I use the French version, since it gives the form of the oath taken by Edward II. Schramm, *Arch. f. Urkundenforsch.*, XV, 349-50, argues on philological grounds that the Latin version ("leges et consuetudines . . . quas vulgus elegerit") is the original. Richardson and Sayles say that the French was the original and that the Latin represents an attempt to make the new oath resemble the old one more closely (*Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, XIII, 140-41).

<sup>72</sup> McIlwain, *Growth of Political Thought*, p. 196, is almost the only modern scholar who holds this view. Richardson and Sayles admit, however, that the form in which the question was asked in 1308 might suggest that it was merely an amplification of the first promise in the oath to preserve the ancient laws (*Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, XIII, 143).

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 142-43, XIV, 9. Richardson later receded from this extreme position. See *Transactions*, pp. 146 ff., and n. 76 below.



mon council or of parliament was promising primarily to accept the decisions of the prelates and barons. Wilkinson accepts this conclusion but tries to avoid the difficulties created by the assumption that the king made an unlimited grant of power to the magnates. He claims that the oath was devised to meet a specific problem which arose in 1308 and that it was only by accident that it became a permanent part of the coronation ritual. His argument is that the barons were dissatisfied with Edward's behavior before the coronation and that they delayed the ceremony until he promised to meet their demands for reform. The promise was worked into the coronation oath in the shape of a pledge to accept all laws chosen by the "community of the realm", and the barons used this pledge to secure the exile of Gaveston and the appointment of the Ordainers.<sup>74</sup> It is a great temptation to accept this hypothesis, since it supports the views urged in this paper, but there are two facts which make it untenable. In the first place, as Wilkinson himself says, it "is difficult to understand why it [the promise] was passed over with so little comment at the time, and was so seldom referred to in unmistakable terms in succeeding years".<sup>75</sup> If Edward had promised to do whatever the barons asked, why did they fail to remind the people of England of this promise in the repeated crises of the reign? In the second place, if the promise in the coronation oath led directly to the Ordinances, why were words reminiscent of this promise placed in the Statute of York, which abolished the Ordinances? This last consideration suggests that it is possible to interpret the oath in a way which is less unfavorable to royal authority. Why can we not assume that the oath, like the statute, described normal, constitutional procedure? The king had always promised to enforce the good old laws, the customs which had existed from time immemorial. But now men were becoming aware that there was a new sort of law, which was not customary but statutory. Therefore the oath had to be modified to include a promise to enforce statute law. The king did not promise to accept anything and everything demanded by the "community"; he merely promised to enforce ("tenir et garder") laws which were properly made.<sup>76</sup> Laws

<sup>74</sup> Wilkinson, in *Historical Essays*, pp. 407 ff. Schramm, *English Coronation*, pp. 207 ff., follows Wilkinson with some reservations.

<sup>75</sup> Wilkinson, in *Historical Essays*, p. 412.

<sup>76</sup> McIlwain, *Growth of Political Thought*, p. 196, translates the "tenendas" and "pro-  
tendendas" of the Latin version as "give effect to". Schramm, *English Coronation*, p. 205,  
thinks that the barons felt that the recent legislation of Edward I had to be preserved, but  
he argues that this was done in the first article of the oath, taking the Edward there  
mentioned to be Edward I rather than Edward the Confessor. Richardson, in *Transactions*,  
pp. 150-51, denies that the clause refers primarily to statutes but says that it is "a guar-



should be made<sup>77</sup> solemnly and publicly; they should receive the assent of the people who were to be bound by them, but in 1308, as in 1322, no one doubted that that assent could be given by the barons and prelates, the ancient representatives of the community of the realm. This interpretation, like all others, is open to certain objections, but it is not necessary to insist on it for the purposes of this article. The important thing is that, by any interpretation, the "community of the realm" of the coronation oath cannot refer exclusively to the commons, that it must include the magnates, and that it probably means primarily the latter group. Study of the coronation oath confirms our earlier impression that approval of the community of the realm was necessary for legislation but that the magnates were considered capable of giving such approval.

One more point may be considered. There are certain acts of the reign of Edward II which have the form of a statute but which are actually judgments of the high court of parliament. Even at the height of their power the commons never succeeded in gaining the right to participate in the judicial activity of parliament. Yet in describing these actions, in which the commons could have had no part, the authority of the community of the realm is invoked. The clearest case is in 1319, when the prelates, earls, barons, "et totam comunitatem regni" record that all gifts to Piers Gaveston were declared utterly void, "tam per prelates, comites, et barones quam per totam comunitatem regni", and therefore reject a petition by his widow for some of his lands.<sup>78</sup> To record a judgment and to decide a petition are purely judicial acts, and it is hard to believe that the commons were consulted on this occasion.

We conclude, therefore, that the use of the phrase, "the community of the realm", had little constitutional significance. It was a redundant expression, which could be inserted or left out at the pleasure of a

---

antee that those agreed corrections or amplifications of the law shall be observed which the commonalty have demanded or willingly accepted".

<sup>77</sup> I use "make" here in the most general sense, without trying to answer the question as to whether statutes could make new law or merely interpret and expand old law.

<sup>78</sup> Cole, p. 49. The case of the acts against the Despensers is not so clear. *Statutes of the Realm*, I, 181, says that the charges against the Despensers were brought by "prelatz, countes, barouns et les autres piers de la terre et commune du roialme", but the judgment against them (*ibid.*, p. 184) mentions only "piers de la terre, countes et barouns". But the Despensers claimed (*Calendar of the Close Rolls, 1318-1323*, London, 1895, p. 545) that no petition was sent in against them in the ordinary course of parliament and that charges were brought only when the magnates came in arms "and made their said award against reason as of a matter treated and agreed on amongst themselves by their own authority in the king's absence". There is no doubt that the judgment against the Despensers was the work of the lay barons alone, and it seems likely that they alone brought the charges, though they covered themselves with the name of the "commune du roialme".

clerk.<sup>79</sup> It was usually inserted in statutes, perhaps because it made it appear that they were based on that universal consent which was so dear to medieval political theorists. It was not a technical phrase which meant the representatives of shires and boroughs, and it was not used when it was necessary to describe those representatives precisely. The knights and burgesses could not yet claim to be the only, or even the chief, spokesmen for the community of the realm. The use of this phrase in the Statute of York was not a recognition of the increased importance of the representative elements in parliament. The statute, in attempting to restore the normal functioning of government, did recognize the importance of parliament,<sup>80</sup> but it said nothing about the position of the commons in parliament. The gains which the knights and burgesses made during the reign of Edward II were not consecrated by the Statute of York.

JOSEPH R. STRAYER.

*Princeton University.*

<sup>79</sup> See above, n. 61, and *Statutes of the Realm*, I, 187, 188. The statute revoking the pardon granted to those who had attacked the Despencers was made with the assent of "prelatz, countes, barons, chivalers des counteez et la commune du roialme", but in a writ sent to the judges the king said the pardon was revoked "de comuni consilio prelatorum, comitum, baronum et aliorum procerum regni nostri".

<sup>80</sup> Richardson and Sayles, *Rot. Parl.*, p. 95. At a parliament of 1325 at which the commons were not present, Edward II made a speech about recent disasters in Gascony. The opening words seem a good example of the procedure described by the Statute of York: "Seignurs, ieo vous ai monstre ascunes choses qi appendent a la coroune qi cheent en debat, come celi qest vostre chief et qi en ad la souereyne garde et come celi qi prest est a meintenir la coroune en touz ses dreitz, par conseil et eide de vous, et a deffendre le come un homme purra fere . . . sur quele chose iai touz iours voz conseals demandez et rien en la dite busoigne sanz conseil nay fet, par qoi ie entenge avoir fait ce qi a moy apertient." Here we have the king, at a time when he was absolute master of the government, explaining his policy to a parliament composed only of magnates and asking their advice.

## THE KNIGHTS OF THE GOLDEN CIRCLE

### THE CAREER OF GEORGE BICKLEY

#### I

THROUGHOUT the decade from 1850 to 1860 American expansionist desires asserted themselves repeatedly, in the filibustering expeditions of Lopez and William Walker, in the formulation of the Ostend Manifesto, and in the messages of Presidents Pierce and Buchanan. Adventurers were faring forth from the United States in the spirit of Manifest Destiny. Patriotism, excitement, and land hunger were stock motives impelling filibusters, to which was added desire for sectional advantage. Such expeditions often originated in, or started from, the South, but sentiment favorable to territorial expansion was by no means confined to that section despite the complication of the slavery issue.<sup>1</sup> The present study will concern itself, however, with a purely Southern aspect of the desire for territorial aggrandizement.

Doubtless there were many Americans who, filled with self-confidence and imbued with the necessity of spreading beneficent American institutions to less fortunate lands, viewed with increasing satisfaction chaotic political conditions obtaining in Mexico as the decade closed. They saw in the region south of the Rio Grande a vast new field in which "expansion and progress" might become a reality.<sup>2</sup> Of this type of American was George W. L. Bickley, who sought to translate ideas into action by the founding, in 1859-60, of the secret and military organization known as the Knights of the Golden Circle, the instrument by which Mexico was to be Americanized and ultimately annexed, the slavery controversy settled in favor of the South, and his own fame and fortune won.

A cursory examination of the career of this remarkable individual illuminates much of the social scene of the two decades preceding the Civil War, an individualistic age characterized by real social and intel-

<sup>1</sup> Carl Russell Fish, *The Rise of the Common Man, 1830-1850* (New York, 1927), pp. 315-16.

<sup>2</sup> Ebullient Americanism in the form of the "Young America" movement was a feature of the early fifties. Exaltation of our republican and democratic ideas, intervention in Europe, and territorial expansion were the leading ideas. Merle E. Curti, "Young America", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXII (Oct., 1926), 34-55.

lectual progress but unfortunately also by much charlatanism.<sup>3</sup> George Bickley had behind him a career typical of the filibuster and adventurer of the fifties.<sup>4</sup> Born in southwest Virginia in 1819, he ran away from home at an early age. After a youth and early manhood replete with adventure, the details of which seem impossible to unravel, he emerged around the year 1850 as a practicing physician in Jeffersonville, now Tazewell, Virginia. Interesting himself in historical research, he became one of the founders of the local historical society and in 1852 published his *History of the Settlement and Indian Wars of Tazewell County, Virginia*,<sup>5</sup> a pioneer work in the field. Turning to fiction, the versatile doctor brought out shortly afterward a brief novel, *Adalaska*, a wild tale permeated with "Young America" ideas.<sup>6</sup> Drifting to Cincinnati sometime in the year 1851, he accepted a professorship in the Eclectic Medical Institute of that city, where he remained intermittently till 1858. Although conscientious in the discharge of his professorial duties<sup>7</sup> and placing his oratorical talents at the disposal of the institute on formal occasions, he found time to establish a literary magazine, the *West American Review*, of which he became editor. This periodical, however, proved to be but another of the short-lived literary projects of the period, expiring in the same year that saw its birth.<sup>8</sup> Simultaneously

<sup>3</sup> John Bach McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States* (8 vols., New York, 1883-1913), VII, VIII; Fish; Arthur Charles Cole, *The Irrepressible Conflict, 1850-1865* (New York, 1934).

<sup>4</sup> His full name was George William Lamb Bickley. In the period 1859-61 he dropped the two middle names but used them before and after that time.

<sup>5</sup> Cincinnati, 1852. Bickley's *History* has been reprinted several times. See William C. Pendleton, *History of Tazewell County and Southwest Virginia, 1748-1920* (Richmond, 1920).

<sup>6</sup> Bickley, *Adalaska; or, The Strange and Mysterious Family of the Cave of Geneva* (Cincinnati, 1853).

<sup>7</sup> He was listed by the *Daily Cincinnati Gazette*, Sept. 8, 1852, as "Professor of Materia Medica, Therapeutics, and Medical Botany". Although claiming to be a graduate in medicine of the University of London, class of 1842, and to have studied with the famous Dr. Elliotson, who is said to have signed his diploma, the evidence casts serious doubt on these claims. The *Eclectic Medical Journal*, XII (Mar., 1853), 140-41, asserted Bickley's claims. The authorities at the University of London fail, however, to find his name among the records of that university. George F. Goodchild to the author, Jan. 29, 1934. Dr. Elliotson resigned from the University of London in 1838. *Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. by Leslie Stephen (New York and London, 1889), XVII, 264-66. Perhaps Bickley had no medical degree. For ease of access to the medical profession in the West in a slightly earlier period see R. Carlyle Buley, "Pioneer Health and Medical Practices in the Old Northwest prior to 1840", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XX (Mar., 1934), 497-520.

<sup>8</sup> *The West American Review: A Critical Cyclopaedia of Literature, Science, and Art*, I (Apr.-Dec., 1853). Of particular interest to this study is the article "Jamaica", presumably written by Bickley. The writer thought England might soon lose this possession and said

he addressed his facile pen to the writing of several medical books<sup>9</sup> and assisted in editing the *Eclectic Medical Journal*, to which he was a prolific contributor.<sup>10</sup> This dynamic man, as if to pile Ossa on Pelion, furnished the press with voluminous copy, lectured to the Ohio Law School on medical jurisprudence, and addressed the public on various topics of general interest.

At the same time he was manifesting a keen interest in fraternal organizations, having established in 1853 the "Wayne Circle of the Brotherhood of the Union", an association "to foster a Constitutional Union, perpetuate American history, and dignify labor".<sup>11</sup> Moreover, he is said to have been a member of the Know-Nothing order, which fact, however, did not deter him from supporting Buchanan for President in 1856.<sup>12</sup> During that year he was listed as one of the editors of the *Ohio Pennant* of Portsmouth, in which town he was engaged in the improvement of property.<sup>13</sup> Finding none of these ventures financially satisfactory, he quit medicine altogether in 1858, this time to devote his energies to the American Patent Company of Cincinnati, an organization for the promoting of inventions and the handling of patent cases. The quondam doctor was now a director of this company and

---

significantly: "These remarks are not made with the intention of goading on to action that immense body of men who now stand ready, at a given signal, to pour their thousands and tens of thousands on Cuba, like a field of Eastern locusts; for we regard any such movements as unwise and premature." He predicted that the future would give us Mexico, Central America, and the islands of the Caribbean (*ibid.*, pp. 14-24), an interesting aludgment of the Knights of the Golden Circle seven years later.

<sup>9</sup> Bickley, *Principles of Scientific Botany* (Cincinnati, 1853); the same work was published under the title, *Physiological and Scientific Botany* (Cincinnati, 1853). He published *Positive Medical Agents* a year or so later, probably in New York. A list of "Standard Eclectic Works by Prof. G. W. L. Bickley" also included three works said to have been in press: *American Eclecticism*, *Syllabus of Physiology*, and *Syllabus of Medical Jurisprudence*. See *Eclectic Med. Jour.*, XVII (1858), opp. p. 241.

<sup>10</sup> For Bickley's "History of the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati, and its Ethical Peculiarities" see *Eclectic Med. Jour.*, XVI (Jan., 1857), 9-15; *ibid.* (Feb., 1857), 57-64; *ibid.* (Mar., 1857), 105-112; *ibid.* (Apr., 1857), 153-56. See also Bickley, "Introductory Lecture, delivered before the Eclectic Medical Class, Nov. 6, 1852", *ibid.*, XII (Mar., 1853), 102-111.

<sup>11</sup> Columbus (Ohio) *Crisis*, Dec. 30, 1863. This patriotic society was founded by George Lippard of Philadelphia, who was the order's "Supreme Washington". *Dictionary of American Biography*, XI, ed. by Dumas Malone (New York, 1933), 285-86.

<sup>12</sup> Atlanta *Southern Confederacy* in the Norfolk *Southern Argus*, May 16, 1860.

<sup>13</sup> File of the *Ohio Pennant* in the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio. Bickley was listed as one of the editors from February 15 to May 16, 1856. Later he sought backing to establish a great conservative daily newspaper with which to combat the influence of the New York *Tribune*. Bickley to John J. Crittenden, July 25, 1856, MS., Crittenden Papers, Library of Congress.

editor of its organ, a pretentious weekly journal known as the *Scientific Artisan*.<sup>14</sup> This work occupied Bickley till the spring of 1859, after which he directed his entire attention to that most famous of all his manifold schemes, the Knights of the Golden Circle. In regard to his personal appearance, it may be of interest to allow a contemporary to describe him as he appeared late in 1860. "Gen. Bickley is", said the *Houston Telegraph*, "a tall, fine looking, middle aged gentleman, having an uncommonly fine expression of countenance, and a high intellectual forehead."<sup>15</sup> Such, then, is a partial description of the background of the man who, styling himself "General"<sup>16</sup> and signing his manifestoes "President General of the American Legion, K. G. C.", prepared to hasten the southward march of Manifest Destiny.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup> For the purposes of the American Patent Company see Charles Cist, *Sketches and Statistics of Cincinnati in 1859* (Cincinnati, 1859), pp. 358-59; *Scientific Artisan*, Aug. 19, 1858. Bickley's name was last listed in *ibid.*, Apr. 23, 1859, as editor and director. See the curious article apparently written by Bickley, "The United States of America", in which the extinction of African slavery was predicted. "That the institution is one altogether unenviable, every reasonable man in America will at once admit." Bickley, *The Inventors' Almanac for 1859* (Cincinnati, 1859), pp. 3-7. The flaming proslavery speeches of the head of the Knights of the Golden Circle in the next year contrast sharply with these sentiments.

<sup>15</sup> Harrison (Texas) *Flag*, Nov. 17, 1860.

<sup>16</sup> The assertion was made that Bickley attended West Point but was forced to leave because of ill health; it was claimed that he had served in the Mexican War and later "witnessed" some of the severest fighting in the Crimean War. Atlanta *Southern Confederacy* in the Norfolk *Southern Argus*, May 16, 1860. Perhaps it was necessary to attempt to build up Bickley as a military man inasmuch as he was then at the head of a military organization, but the evidence discredits his claims to military experience. The authorities at West Point can find no record of his ever having been a cadet there. Lieutenant H. McC. Forde to the author, June 15, 1933. As to his service in the Mexican War, it has been impossible to find his name on the rolls of any organization serving the United States in that war. Major General James F. McKinley to the author, Mar. 31, 1934. It is entirely improbable that Bickley aided the Russians in the field in the Crimean War. The title "General" was self-assumed, but most newspapers accepted it without question.

<sup>17</sup> For a friendly biographical account of his career to 1860 see the article, "Who is Gen. Bickley and what are his Objects?", reprinted from the Atlanta *Southern Confederacy* in the Norfolk *Southern Argus*, May 16, 1860; for a satirical review of Bickley's life by a Northern contemporary see the Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, Apr. 6, 1860. A brief biography in Harvey Wickes Felner, *History of the Eclectic Medical Institute, 1845-1902* (Cincinnati, 1902), pp. 110-13, covers his entire life and includes, pp. 112-13, a reprint from the Abingdon *Virginian*, Oct. 4, 1867, which was written shortly after Bickley's death. Even briefer is Otto Juettner, *Daniel Drake and his Followers* (Cincinnati, 1909), pp. 362-63. A comparison of these accounts reveals many discrepancies of statement in the reconstruction of the activities of this adventurer. For an autobiographical sketch see a letter of Bickley dated Columbus, Ohio, Dec. 7, 1863, written while he was in prison and consequently not entirely trustworthy. The investigator can only conclude that assertions made by Bickley must be corroborated by other sources before they can be accepted as facts. An important collection of papers relating to Bickley is in the office of the Judge Advocate

## II

Diplomatic relations between the United States and Mexico in the decade prior to 1860 were characterized by friction and mutual distrust. Boundary disputes, the activities of William Walker, the desire of the Buchanan administration to purchase Chihuahua, and Sam Houston's proposal in 1858 to establish a protectorate over Mexico<sup>18</sup> produced uneasiness in the latter country. Anti-American leaders there leaned toward European assistance against the aggressive "Colossus of the North". The avid and persistent land hunger exhibited by the Buchanan government proved this feeling to have been well founded.<sup>19</sup>

Fierce internecine warfare had raged in Mexico since 1858 between the Conservative and the Liberal (Juarez) factions, reducing the country to anarchy and renewing hope north of the Rio Grande of territorial gain at the expense of a helpless neighbor. In his message to Congress of 1859 Buchanan vigorously supported the Juarez party and protested against "outrages" visited upon American citizens in Mexico City. He recommended the creation of a military force by the United States government to act in concert with Juarez and penetrate into the interior of Mexico, a suggestion which must have given encouragement to those entertaining filibustering schemes. The culmination of Buchanan's Mexican policy was the signing, late in 1859, of the McLane-Ocampo Treaty and Convention, the terms of which were so generous to the United States as virtually to establish a protectorate over Mexico.<sup>20</sup> The McLane treaty, obscured by the slavery question and presidential politics, was defeated in the Senate by the Republican members.<sup>21</sup> In spite of the final disposition of this treaty there seemed to exist at the opening of the year 1860 a combination of circumstances that apparently made auspicious the launching of a grand filibustering enterprise which would ultimately bring that coveted land under the aegis of the United States.

To these favorable factors may be added a wide degree of enthu-

---

General, Washington, D. C. There was an interesting parallel in the careers of Bickley and William Walker, the most famous filibuster of the age. Both were physicians and journalists; both were involved in shipping schemes. *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIX, ed. by Dumas Malone (New York, 1936), 363-65.

<sup>18</sup> This proposal was defeated in the United States Senate in 1858, but Houston continued to advocate it. Walter P. Webb, *The Texas Rangers* (New York, 1935), p. 205.

<sup>19</sup> Dexter Perkins, *The Monroe Doctrine, 1826-1867* (Baltimore, 1933), pp. 318-37.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 337-42. J. Fred Rippy, *The United States and Mexico* (New York, 1926), pp. 212-29.

<sup>21</sup> W. Stull Holt, *Treaties defeated by the Senate* (Baltimore, 1933), pp. 92-96.

siasm for the Americanization and annexation of Mexico, which was manifested by responsible Southern spokesmen in 1860. Insofar as the press gave voice to the sentiment of that section, it can be asserted that there was general interest and keen desire to consummate such a plan. The fiery Memphis *Daily Avalanche* believed that the "true genius" of American policy consisted of "occupation and annexation" and, peering into the future, saw not only Mexico but Cuba and all Central America as possessions of the United States within fifty years.<sup>22</sup>

That "crookedest of all boundary lines, the Rio Grande" was offensive to an Arkansas observer, who insisted that the Sierre Madre range must become the boundary; otherwise the people of the United States would take all of Mexico.<sup>23</sup> A Southern urban journal stated the axiom, "Territorial extension is the prevailing idea of the present age", and felt confident that the process of Manifest Destiny would give all Spanish America to the United States. It would be lamentable indeed, according to this same source, if sectional disruption should displace expansion.<sup>24</sup> Although the Augusta *Chronicle and Sentinel* feared that the obstacles were overwhelming, it decided upon later consideration that it would be well if "Old Sam" Houston would invade and conquer Mexico at once, drive the Indians into the sea, and enslave the Negroes and half-breeds, anterior to assumption of control by the Anglo-Saxons. They were to civilize the country and prepare it for annexation to the United States. No European government was to be permitted there.<sup>25</sup> The South was reassured on the question of slavery and the territories, then uppermost in the sectional mind, by the reminder that Cuba and Mexico were fields "where sunbeams and slavery are kindred things".<sup>26</sup> The Norfolk *Day Book* took familiar imperialistic ground by urging the introduction into benighted Mexico of peace, civilization, prosperity, religious freedom, and "for all we know, the Star Spangled Banner".<sup>27</sup> The appellation, "our sick man", was applied to Mexico, and the belief was expressed that the time was approaching when the United States would have to take care of him.<sup>28</sup> A less lofty but more realistic note was sounded by the Montgomery *Daily Post*: "The commercial world is demanding that a country so essential to its interests shall no longer

<sup>22</sup> Jan. 28, Feb. 2, 1860.

<sup>23</sup> Little Rock *Arkansas True Democrat*, Apr. 7, 1860.

<sup>24</sup> New Orleans *Daily Picayune*, June 20, Sept. 30, 1860.

<sup>25</sup> Feb. 24, Mar. 10, 1860.

<sup>26</sup> Augusta *Daily Constitutionalist*, Mar. 13, 1860.

<sup>27</sup> Mar. 9, 1860.

<sup>28</sup> Nashville *Patriot*, Mar. 21, 1860. Mexico was frequently asserted to be worse off than Turkey, that "sick man" of Europe.



be permitted to remain an interruption to its advancement, and a scene of disgraceful strife.”<sup>29</sup> Thus it may be concluded that Southern press opinion was in substantial accord with the idea that inasmuch as “that terrestrial paradise on earth” [Mexico] was geographically adjacent to the South, Southerners would people it and carry their institutions with them and that assuredly the time for action had arrived.<sup>30</sup> And in this connection it is significant that shrewd Governor Sam Houston of Texas had come to the same conclusion and was himself prepared to lead an attack on Mexico.<sup>31</sup>

To meet such an inviting situation the mystic order of the Knights of the Golden Circle was held in readiness by the indefatigable leader, General George Bickley, who set forth the order’s objectives, first in

<sup>29</sup> Apr. 4, 1860. This was an assertion of a commercial doctrine of international eminent domain.

<sup>30</sup> It would be possible to multiply almost indefinitely supporting press quotations to indicate Southern zeal in the matter. The *Memphis Morning Enquirer*, Apr. 24, 1860, favored annexation on the score of terrible internal conditions. *Brownlow's Knoxville Whig*, Sept. 15, 1860, approved the Americanization idea. The *Nashville Daily Gazette*, Apr. 11, 1860, denounced the polyglot population of Mexico, adding significantly, “her resources seem inexhaustibly bountiful. What might she not become under a liberal protection given to her industry, her commerce, and her property?” The *Gainesville (Alabama) Independent*, Jan. 21, 1860, declared that there had been no good government in Mexico since the Aztecs and warned that “strong, energetic, and comparatively virtuous races always overshadow and measurably absorb weak and vicious ones”. The “greaser” must improve or perish like the Indian. The *Jacksonville (Alabama) Republican*, May 3, 1860, asserted that an Americanization program would have the warmest commendation of all Southerners. The *New Orleans Bee*, June 8, 1860, said: “We have for years entertained and expressed the opinion that the only chance for Mexico is the gradual depuration of its effete blood by the strong and vigorous current of the Anglo-Saxon race.” The *New Orleans Daily Crescent*, Jan. 11, 1860, was certain that at last we had convinced British diplomats of the futility of opposing the decree of fate that we should have the entire continent. The *New Orleans Daily Delta*, Mar. 16, 1860, expressed a similar view and urged anticipation of English intervention by a “bold and decisive policy”. The *New Orleans Courier*, May 13, 1860, welcomed excitement along the Rio Grande as a diversion from the hackneyed topics of the day. The *Atlanta Locomotive* in the *Columbus (Georgia) Daily Times*, Apr. 5, 1860, referred to the thousands of Southerners who were eager to take Mexico. The *Paulding (Mississippi) Eastern Clarion*, Feb. 29, 1860, suggested that the United States annex the northern provinces of Mexico as a solution of the border troubles. See also the *Vicksburg Sun* in the *Ripley (Mississippi) Advertiser*, Apr. 11, 1860. Evidently many Southern papers opposed to expansion were silent. Occasionally dissent was expressed. The *Richmond Whig*, Mar. 27, 1860, assailed intervention as unwise and as an effort of “a corrupt and imbecile administration” to gain prestige. The *Richmond Daily Dispatch*, May 1, 1860, was refreshing in the candid assertion that it was difficult to elevate the morals of our neighbors by stealing their country and also voiced the heresy that our political institutions might not be as attractive to others as to ourselves. The *Charleston Mercury* preferred to have Southern rights defined before seeking new territory. *Cincinnati Daily Commercial*, Apr. 5, 1860.

<sup>31</sup> Webb, pp. 203-205.

an authoritative pamphlet intended for members,<sup>32</sup> and later in a series of stirring manifestoes and speeches addressed to the Southern people.<sup>33</sup> In an elaborate exposition the K. G. C. was declared to be a powerful military organization, around which would rally the forces that would disenthral the cotton states from the alleged oppression of the manufacturing and commercial interests of the North.<sup>34</sup> The agricultural South, furthermore, was held to be devoted to old forms, detesting the innovations and "isms" of which the North spawned such a large number. If the question were asked, how was the South to protect her civilization from contaminating ideas—unsympathetic critics would add all new ideas—and liberate herself from economic servitude, the answer was simple. The gallant Knights of the Golden Circle were prepared to colonize Mexico, peaceably and without the violation of any law; indeed, it was claimed that a class existed in Mexico which would welcome them, and Juarez was said to have sought and obtained a promise of their co-operation.<sup>35</sup> Although some critics had attacked Buchanan's Mexican policy as being too aggressive, Bickley found it regrettably timid. All he asked of the American government, however, was adherence to the Monroe Doctrine and a rigid execution of the neutrality laws.<sup>36</sup>

Bickley's fertile imagination foresaw "energetic Anglo-Saxons" as members of the K. G. C., ensconced in Mexico, who would then proceed with the process of "Texasizing" that country, which in turn

<sup>32</sup> *Rules, Regulations, and Principles of the K. G. C. issued by order of the Congress of the K. C. S., and the General President* (New York, 1859?). Several communications in this pamphlet were signed by Bickley. Bickley Papers, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Washington, D. C.

<sup>33</sup> See K. G. C. *Address*, first issued in a pamphlet, reprinted in the *Daily Louisville Democrat*, Sept. 2, 1860.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization* (2 vols., New York, 1927), II, 4-7. In another manifesto Bickley declared: "It is useless longer to attempt to disguise the truth, that there are now but two parties—a Northern and a Southern party; the one with manufacturing, the other with agricultural interests—and that their variance is so great that a reconciliation is almost an impossibility." *Richmond Daily Whig*, July 18, 1860.

<sup>35</sup> Bickley later asserted that prominent Mexican officials co-operated with his scheme—Ocampo, Miramon, and others. *Columbus (Ohio) Crisis*, Dec. 30, 1863. The editor of the Abingdon *Virginian* claimed that he had seen letters from Juarez and Miramon to Bickley "proffering co-operation, grants of land, and other great advantages". Felter, pp. 112-13. Yet Juarez's agent denied that he desired K. G. C. interference. *St. Louis Daily Morning Republican*, Apr. 14, 1860. Other denials were issued from Mexico. *New Orleans Daily Crescent*, June 2, 14, Aug. 20, 1860.

<sup>36</sup> Yet in an address to his soldiers Bickley said: "We are at all times determined not to be found in conflict with our country's laws, yet to avoid them requires politic action, and skillful management." *Rules, Regulations, and Principles of the K. G. C.*, pp. 19-24.

would lead to the final absorption by the United States of the entire region from the Rio Grande to Yucatan. In one of his proclamations the general paid his respects to the Spanish American, who had criminally neglected and mismanaged the bounteous resources with which Providence had endowed the luscious country. Instead the Spanish American had "mixed and intermarried with Negro and Indian, until pure blood is no longer found".<sup>37</sup>

In earnest words the South was informed that the only hope of restoring the political and economic sectional balance lay in the adoption of this program, which would be followed by the ultimate addition of twenty-five slave states to the American Union—surely enough to satisfy the demands of the most ardent slave expansionist or devotee of Manifest Destiny. It was indeed an alluring prospect which Bickley held out before the eyes of Southerners, desperately concerned at the moment for the future of slavery in the territories and the maintenance of sectional equality.<sup>38</sup> If they would but support his project, fifty new slave state senators would one day appear in Washington and sixty or more new members of the House of Representatives. It was hinted darkly that this territory, if rejected by the United States, could as easily be annexed by a Southern Confederacy.<sup>39</sup>

Probably with some degree of accuracy, General Bickley warned the South that the North coveted Mexico, Cuba, and Central America and would, if possible, make free states out of this territory; the Knights planned to forestall the Abolitionists by removing the future conflict between North and South to "the valleys and plains of Mexico". The

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4; *Daily Louisville Democrat*, Sept. 2, 1860.

<sup>38</sup> Bickley dilated upon inequality in another communication. "The North has a population of twenty millions, and an area of *two millions, one hundred and three thousand, six hundred and fifty eight square miles*, embracing the territories. The South has a population of twelve millions, and an area of only *eight hundred and fifty one thousand, four hundred and forty eight square miles*. For each of her population, the North has *seventy* acres of land—while the South for hers has only *forty five*." He protested that the South, which had borne the burden of the Mexican War, was excluded from land acquired as a result. Congressional remedy was hopeless because of the predominance of Free-Soil members. *Richmond Daily Whig*, July 18, 1860.

<sup>39</sup> *Daily Louisville Democrat*, Sept. 2, 1860. "Now, this truth must be apparent to every thinking man; with Mexico Americanized and *Southernized*, our area of territory would be nearly equal to that of the North, including the Southern Territories of Arizonia [*sic*], New Mexico, and California. Our population would be equal to hers. Besides we should possess advantages of climate, soil, productions and geographical position of a very marked character." The North was depicted as busy sending out emissaries of abolition, while the South was said to be doing nothing to counteract this influence, always excepting the work being done by the Knights of the Golden Circle. *Richmond Daily Whig*, July 18, 1860.

successful operation of this policy would enable the South to give up the contest for all land north of the thirty-fourth parallel within the existing boundaries of the United States.

Aside from the much desired restoration of political equality, or better, the establishment of Southern predominance in the Union, the consummation of the K. G. C. scheme would bring untold material benefit not only to the South but to the hated Yankees as well. The much discussed Pacific railroad, traversing the southern route, would doubtless be translated into reality, and this, in turn, would enhance land values of the Rio Grande Valley and Arizona. A tremendous impetus would be given to shipbuilding, mining, and manufacturing in the South, which would furnish employment for all. Economic opportunities in Mexico would touch a responsive chord in the notorious Yankee avarice; Northern manufacturers and merchants, soon to be absorbed in profit making, were expected to support the movement. To the people of Texas was promised the elimination of border disturbances, which were agitating the politics of that state at the time. One boon which was offered, of such naïve character as must have touched the Southern sense of humor, was the assertion that the numerous proposed states presented “wonderful” openings for discontented—and perhaps discredited—politicians. Furthermore, the old trick of diverting attention from perplexing domestic problems by engaging in aggressive foreign policy was also advanced as an argument. It was asserted that the mere announcement that fifteen thousand Knights of the Golden Circle were en route to Vera Cruz would greatly obscure the bitter sectional antagonism. Indeed, in the mind of the writer there was every reason why the South should espouse such an advantageous program, “the only practical solution to the slave question ever offered to the American People”.<sup>40</sup>

If these inducements were not enough, the possibilities of the K. G. C. organization in the event of secession and civil war were not to be overlooked. The South had been suffering since the John Brown raid from a feeling of uneasiness, which became a terroristic psychosis in the summer of 1860, when it was commonly believed that

<sup>40</sup> Bickley could think of hundreds of reasons why Southerners should support the K. G. C. Among other reasons were that of advancement of religion untainted by Northern “isms” and the repeal of Northern “treasonable” laws. The Knights would kill Wall Street and New Orleans lobbies, which, he said, were constantly scheming to plunder the Mexicans. Evidently competition was not desired. *Daily Louisville Democrat*, Sept. 2, 1860. Bickley also appealed for aid in restoring peace and good government to Mexico. *Richmond Daily Whig*, July 18, 1860.

diabolical Abolitionist emissaries were at work fomenting servile insurrections.<sup>41</sup> It was explained that the Knights of the Golden Circle might form a domestic police system extending throughout the slave states. Even more exciting was the hint that before the year 1860 had closed, Southern governors would have need of the order—an innuendo which assumed that trouble would follow the election of Lincoln. If this condition should develop, the District of Columbia, rather than Mexico, would become the goal of the K. G. C. But whatever the future held in store for America, the Knights of the Golden Circle were to be guided by that chauvinistic principle, “The South, right or wrong”.<sup>42</sup>

The Southern press received the plans of the order with enthusiasm, and many newspapers became its exponents; some of these not only opened their news columns to accounts of the progress of the K. G. C. but editorially endorsed, interpreted, and clarified Bickley’s pronouncements.<sup>43</sup> These journalistic spokesmen for expansion emphasized the founder’s denial that the Knights were filibusters. It was carefully pointed out by the New Orleans *Courier* that Bickley’s men were preparing to operate in “the broad field of Civil War in Mexico”, their object being to place the Juarez government in power at Mexico City. This organ could compare the K. G. C. leaders with Lafayette, Kosciusko, and DeKalb and in a peroration exclaimed, “God speed the K. G. C.”<sup>44</sup> Another friend declared that the government of Mexico had invited the industrious and intelligent youth to come there to settle and that to facilitate such a plan the K. G. C. had been created. There could be little doubt, he believed, that this organization held the destiny of Mexico in the palm of the hand.<sup>45</sup> The Columbus (Georgia) *Weekly Sun* welcomed the advent of the new order and informed its readers that immediate annexation of Mexico was not the aim of the Knights, who would pave the way for expansion of Southern institutions and relieve the South from the “folds of the monster, Abolition”. It had already been demonstrated in Kansas that the South’s facilities in colonization could not compete with those of the North. The Knights

<sup>41</sup> The Southern press was filled with lurid accounts, some of which were probably of political inspiration. For example, see the Houston *Weekly Telegraph*, July 31, Aug. 14, 1860.

<sup>42</sup> *Daily Louisville Democrat*, Sept. 2, 1860.

<sup>43</sup> Usually those papers favoring expansion approved the K. G. C., at least in the early days of the organization. In the spring of 1860 it was accorded much publicity. The Memphis *Morning Enquirer*, Apr. 24, 1860, found the columns of its exchanges filled with material on the K. G. C. The Lexington *Kentucky Statesman*, Apr. 17, 1860, said that the order was attracting much attention.

<sup>44</sup> Mar. 6, 1860.

<sup>45</sup> Norfolk *Daybook*, Mar. 9, 1860.

feared that immediate annexation would result in the "Kansasizing" of Mexico; therefore they preferred to delay annexation till they had ended civil wars, re-established peace, and opened up a wide field for slavery. All this was to be achieved by the "superior" race which, it was declared, Mexico needed so badly. This Georgia journal also said that it was an important objective of the order to prevent that country from falling into the hands of Europeans and to enforce the Monroe Doctrine. All Southern men, irrespective of political party, should support them.<sup>46</sup> The Vicksburg *Sun* set forth the two objectives of the K. G. C. as (1) to cultivate a martial spirit in the South and (2) to give the South a military organization capable of defending her rights at home and abroad.<sup>47</sup>

The K. G. C. was furnished with an elaborate military organization, ritual, and system of governance. Eligible for membership in this secret and military order were all Southerners of good character and "such worthy Northern men as live in the South and heartily concur with us in our determination to stand by the Constitutional rights of the South". Considerable ingenuity was demonstrated in the fabrication of the intricate K. G. C. organization. Provision was made for three distinct divisions, which in turn were grouped into classes, and finally the classes were subdivided into departments. The first division was entirely a military degree, "appealing strongly to the chivalry and martial pride of our people", consisting of two classes, the Foreign and the Home Guards. The Foreign Guard was composed of "such worthy and eligible men as wish to participate in the wild, glorious, and thrilling adventure of a campaign in Mexico, and who constitute the active army of the K. G. C." Those members of the first degree who, for one reason or another, were incapacitated for active military service and professional men unable to participate because of circumstances were classified as the Home Guard; this body had but two functions: to

<sup>46</sup> Apr. 9, 1860. Three out of four papers in Atlanta were said to have been supporters of the K. G. C. movement. *Montgomery Daily Mail*, Mar. 30, 1860. See the *New Orleans Courier*, Mar. 11, 17, 24, 1860. Widely quoted article, "No Filibusters", *Montgomery Daily Mail*, Mar. 12, 1860. Later this paper expressed doubt. *Ibid.*, May 21, 1860.

<sup>47</sup> *Ripley Advertiser*, Apr. 11, 1860. Yet some thought that there was too much martial spirit in the South already and that this needed a curb rather than a spur. *Memphis Morning Enquirer*, Apr. 24, 1860. Bickley declared in a speech at Montgomery that the "age of chivalry still exists with universal recognition among the children of 'the sunny South' ". *Montgomery Daily Mail*, Mar. 14, 1860. The *Charleston Mercury* thought Bickley protested too much his Southern aims and that because of his modest allusions to the "almighty dollar" he might hail from the "land of wooden nutmegs". In the *Raleigh Semi-Weekly Standard*, Aug. 8, 1860.

defend the order from misrepresentations at home and to aid in the provisioning and transporting of the army. Further, Home Guard members were informed of the plans and movements of the order and enjoyed certain mysterious "advantages and privileges".<sup>48</sup>

The second degree was the commercial and financial division and was likewise divided into two classes, the Foreign and the Home Corps, each of which had special duties to perform. Sutlers, commercial agents, paymasters, postmasters, clerks, physicians, ministers, teachers, editors, hunters, and negotiators were to make up the Foreign Corps; advice, supplies, recruits, and favorable propaganda were to be furnished by the Home Corps of this degree.<sup>49</sup>

The third and highest degree, known as the American Legion, was the political or governing arm of the whole organization, which, like the two lower degrees, was divided into two groups known as the Foreign and the Home Councils. Membership in the Home Council was exceedingly secret, not being known even to members of the lowest degree, and although it was a body "of pure advisement, and takes no active steps", it did guard against violations of the law. Ten departments, representing the interests of agriculture, education, manufacture, finance, religion, police, war, navigation, law, and foreign relations, made up the Foreign Council. A high court of appeals, drawn from three classes of the council, formed the legislative body, which made laws governing the K. G. C., with special regard to numerous capitalist interests. Women were not eligible for admission to this degree but were allowed membership in the two subordinate degrees. Indeed the third degree was said to have been given to but few persons, and those chosen few were required on bended knee to take a solemn oath which invoked the guidance of the Divine Christian authorities.<sup>50</sup>

The K. G. C. army and inducements which were held out to join it may best be described in the optimistic words of the founder and active head.

The army is composed of four divisions of four thousand men each. Each division has four regiments and each regiment ten companies. There is one Major General, four Brigadier Generals, sixteen Colonels, and sixteen Lieutenant Colonels. Thirty two Majors, and one hundred sixty Captains and their company officers, besides staff and department officers. The pay of the army and departments is one-eighth more than the salaries of the U. S. army. For those of the privates who settle in the country 640 acres of land; those who return to the United States, 320 acres of land or \$400 in money. Pen-

<sup>48</sup> *Daily Louisville Democrat*, Sept. 2, 1860.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*      <sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*



sions are provided for those who may be disabled. The rations and clothing are ample. The land for officers is proportioned according to rank.<sup>51</sup>

Volunteer auxiliaries, not regular members of the army, were also encouraged to accompany the Knights in their invasion of Mexico by similar promises of good pay and generous grants of land.<sup>52</sup>

An elaborate ritual, solemn secrets, esoteric codes, signs and passwords known only to the initiated, were all provided, doubtless by the ingenuity of General Bickley, perhaps suggested by the Know-Nothing order, of which he was said to have been a member.<sup>53</sup> In view of the publicity received by the order and an attempted rapid expansion in membership, secrecy was difficult to maintain, and subsequent exposures are not surprising.<sup>54</sup> The ease with which individuals became K. G. C. organizers was made clear by an authoritative spokesman.

A gentleman desiring to be a K. G. C., and to organize a castle [a local lodge], will address a note to the President of the Legion K. G. C., (Gen. Geo. Bickley), at Knoxville, Tennessee, enclosing evidences of his standing and character, when the form of an obligation will be sent to him, which he will fill and acknowledge before a magistrate, or notary public, and return, and enclose with it the sum of five dollars, whereupon the following castle works and papers will be at once forwarded: 7 First Degree Books and 7 Keys. 7 Second Degree Books and 7 Keys. 2 Copies of Instructions. 1 Roll Book. 1 Set Receipts. 20 Copies K. G. C. Address. 1 Copy Rules and Regulations. And such other papers as are needed. Or application may be made to any Colonel of the order, and the money to be so forwarded to him. The works themselves will give all other information.<sup>55</sup>

As in most American fraternal organizations, the financial aspect was by no means neglected, and those familiar with the earlier get-rich-quick schemes of the promoter may suspect that Bickley confidently expected to realize a handsome fortune from the K. G. C. Fees were of course required of the members, and according to an official report,

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.* A critic observed that "without shadow of authority, save that of his own will, Bickley created Colonels, Majors, and Captains in the most absolute and Napoleonic style". *St. Louis Daily Morning Republican*, Apr. 14, 1860. It will be noted that the land scheme was a feature of most filibustering projects of the time.

<sup>52</sup> *Daily Louisville Democrat*, Sept. 2, 1860.

<sup>53</sup> *Degree Book*, pamphlet (pp. 8), Bickley Papers.

<sup>54</sup> *New York Tribune*, June 13, 1859, Mar. 31, 1860; *Staunton Spectator*, Jan. 31, 1860; the *Savannah Daily Morning News*, Jan. 30, 1860, quoted a New York correspondent of the *Charleston Mercury* regarding "professedly authentic exposures of certain newspapers". After the beginning of 1861 lurid and not entirely trustworthy exposés appeared. Anon., *An Authentic Exposition of the "K. G. C."* (Indianapolis, 1861); J. W. Pomfrey, *A True Disclosure and Exposition of the Knights of the Golden Circle* (Cincinnati, 1861), however, bears marked similarity to prospectuses issued by Bickley in 1860.

<sup>55</sup> *Daily Louisville Democrat*, Sept. 2, 1860.



after May 20, 1860, the fees were to be one dollar for the first degree, five dollars for the second, and ten dollars for the third. Weekly dues in all the degrees were to be fixed by the colonels of regiments in their own jurisdictions. Initiation without the payment of dues was expressly forbidden. Loans and gifts were earnestly solicited from those sympathetic with the purposes of the Knights, receivable in money or in other forms.<sup>56</sup> But an insight into the more grandiose financial plans of the order may be gained from an examination of "The American Colonization and Steamship Company of 1 [Vera Cruz]". This company was organized in 1858 as a financial nucleus to gather money for the K.G.C. and to develop a shipping line between Pensacola and Vera Cruz. The company was said to be capitalized at five million dollars, and it was claimed that 10 per cent interest was paid. Moreover, the company was said to control 600,000 acres of excellent land. On this land the company proposed to settle as many as would accept, occupy, and improve 640 acres of land.<sup>57</sup> Such then, in brief, were the main features of the theoretical organization of the K. G. C., not all of which, probably, ever actually functioned as laid down in the rule books by Bickley and his advisers.

It has been suggested that Bickley's lifelong and consuming ambition was to make himself emperor of the polygot population of Mexico and that the ultracomplex system of government was designed to contribute to that end. Certain it is that Bickley was on occasion privately critical of the workings of democracy in the United States. He informed members of the third degree on this point: "We aim at the establishment of a great Democratic monarchy—a Republican Empire, which shall vie in grandeur with the Old Roman Empire, and which shall regenerate and vivify society in Spanish America."<sup>58</sup>

With the aspirations and structure of the K. G. C. in mind, it now becomes necessary to examine the actual progress of the order in the South and to determine just how many of the vaunted objectives approximated realization. General Bickley had evidently done preliminary organizing work before 1860, but it is difficult to determine exactly

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.* Third-degree men were told: "Always remember that this is a selfish organization, which looks to the pecuniary interest of its friends alone." *Degree Book*, p. 7, Bickley Papers.

<sup>57</sup> *Rules, Regulations, and Principles of the K. G. C.*, p. 41. William Walker had been involved in shipping company schemes, by which he had incurred the enmity of Cornelius Vanderbilt. *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIX, 363-65.

<sup>58</sup> *Degree Book*, p. 6, Bickley Papers. See "Political Maxims", *Rules, Regulations, and Principles of the K. G. C.*, pp. 57-60; Felter, p. 112.

when the order began to function. A friendly source dated its founding July 4, 1854, in Lexington, Kentucky, by Bickley and a small group of followers sworn to loyalty.<sup>59</sup> If this were true, the organization probably existed largely in the mind of the founder during the mid-fifties, inasmuch as he was preoccupied in those years with other schemes.<sup>60</sup> In any event, active organizing work was begun by Bickley in 1859, followed by intensive efforts during the succeeding year. In connection with the promotion of his grand plan Bickley established in Baltimore a newspaper, the *American Cavalier*, a warlike Manifest Destiny journal. The militant commander in chief entertained a conviction that all civilization was the fruit of war, and the *American Cavalier* baldly proclaimed, "The fact is, we want a fight, but how to get it is the question."<sup>61</sup>

An eloquent orator and filled with the spirit of modern "chivalry", Bickley engaged for months during 1860 in a vigorous stump-speaking campaign in the Southern states, which he hoped would enlist widespread support for his project. It is indeed remarkable with what facility this plausible man ingratiated himself with Southern editors, who frequently accepted General Bickley at his own estimate.<sup>62</sup> He also drew to his support as active organizers a considerable number of men throughout the South, who were, however, not politically prominent.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>59</sup> Norfolk *Southern Argus*, May 16, 1860.

<sup>60</sup> Confusion exists as to the date of the founding of the K. G. C. The date July 4, 1854, was fixed in Bickley's writings in 1860. *Daily Louisville Democrat*, Sept. 2, 1860. Later Bickley declared it to be of Mexican origin and to date from 1845. Columbus (Ohio) *Crisis*, Dec. 30, 1863. It may be concluded that the actual functioning of the order began in 1859-60.

<sup>61</sup> *American Cavalier*, May 28, 1859. C. P. Curtis was listed as editor and proprietor, but its close connection with the K. G. C. is apparent. This copy is in the Bickley Papers. Edward Bates became indignant when he learned of the establishment of this filibuster paper. *The Diary of Edward Bates*, ed. by Howard K. Beale (Washington, 1933), pp. 18-19. For Bickley's predilection for war see *Rules, Regulations, and Principles of the K. G. C.*, pp. 19-24.

<sup>62</sup> Mobile *Daily Mercury*, Apr. 6, 1860. Copy in Bickley Papers. Harrison (Texas) *Flag*, Nov. 17, 1860.

<sup>63</sup> Some of the men associated with the K. G. C. were: Colonel N. J. Scott, of Auburn, Alabama, Philip D. Woodhouse, Colonel V. D. Groner, Norfolk, Virginia, Colonel John L. Walker, Charles City Court House, Virginia, A. J. McAlpin, Raleigh, North Carolina, Colonel James E. Cureton, Lancaster Court House, South Carolina, Colonel F. W. Dillard, Columbus, Georgia, Colonel H. C. Young, Memphis, Tennessee, Major Charles Bickley, Knoxville, Tennessee, Major William G. Yaeger, Baltimore, Maryland, Colonel Ben M. Harney, Louisville, Kentucky, Colonel James H. R. Taylor, Holly Springs, Mississippi, Major H. C. Castellanos, New Orleans, Louisiana, William H. Judah, Pensacola, Florida, General E. Greer, and Major Sam. J. Richardson, Marshall, Texas. Richmond *Daily Whig*, July 18, 1860.

General Sherman recalled that while he was living in Louisiana, he was visited sometime in 1860 by a man who was said to be a high officer in the K. G. C. Sherman was ignorant of the order until it was explained to him.<sup>64</sup> Certainly during the first months of his canvass Bickley and his program were well received in the lower South.<sup>65</sup>

That ill fortune, however, which had marked Bickley's earlier career now interrupted the progress of the K. G. C. in the form of serious charges against him brought by a group of Knights in New Orleans, who claimed, in a card published in April, that he was an impostor, a liar, and a coward and that through his misrepresentations they had deceived between five and six hundred of their fellow citizens.<sup>66</sup> The New Orleans "troubles", followed by Bickley's abrupt departure from that city, discredited his leadership in no small degree;<sup>67</sup> but the resourceful general soon appeared to defy his enemies with a demand for a complete investigation by a convention of the entire organization, and a detailed reply to the New Orleans charges was made in a letter to the press from the pen of his aide and relative, Charles Bickley.<sup>68</sup> Accordingly a call was issued for a K. G. C. convention to assemble at Raleigh, North Carolina, May 7-11, a convention which not unexpectedly vindicated General Bickley and restored his authority in the order.<sup>69</sup> In spite, however, of the victory at Raleigh and renewed stumping tours, bombastic speeches, and manifestoes in the press, the order seemed to gain less publicity as the summer waned. Bickley returned to his native Virginia, where during the summer months, in company with a clergyman or two, he spoke on K. G. C. business and attempted to recruit members. It appears that he made little impression there, if one may judge by the press notices.<sup>70</sup> Meanwhile headquarters had been

<sup>64</sup> *Memoirs of General William T. Sherman* (2 vols., 2d ed., New York, 1904), I, 180.

<sup>65</sup> *Macon Daily Telegraph*, Mar. 23, 1860, reported that there was much enthusiasm at Bickley's meeting in Atlanta. When he was introduced to a large meeting at Montgomery, Bickley was greeted "with liberal manifestations of applause". *Montgomery Daily Mail*, Mar. 14, 1860.

<sup>66</sup> *Washington Constitution*, Apr. 10, 1860. A New Orleans correspondent wrote that "General Bickley left here after refusing all offers to fight, of which I am told he had plenty." *Montgomery Daily Mail*, Apr. 9, 1860.

<sup>67</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, Apr. 14, 1860.

<sup>68</sup> *Montgomery Daily Mail*, Apr. 12, 1860.

<sup>69</sup> *Raleigh Press* in the *Norfolk Southern Argus*, May 15, 1860.

<sup>70</sup> The *Richmond Daily Whig*, July 18, 1860, published a K. G. C. manifesto but declined to take the order seriously. Bickley promised the people of Lynchburg that the K. G. C. flag would fly over Mexico City on January 1, 1861. Lynchburg *Virginian* in the *Charleston Mercury*, June 7, 1860. The *Daily Baltimore Republican*, Aug. 15, 1860, quoted the *Farmville Journal* on Bickley's visit.

established at Knoxville, Tennessee, and the order's correspondence was directed to that place.<sup>71</sup>

Indeed the attention of the South was by then riveted upon the impending presidential election, and the growing concern for the future gave little opportunity to consider wild filibustering schemes. As always, Bickley, discerning the trend in national affairs, began to shift the emphasis in his appeals, although he had not yet abandoned Mexico as his main objective. A party of speakers represented this new point of view in a meeting at Cleveland, Tennessee, during which one of the spokesmen intimated that Southern governors would have need of the K.G.C. "soon". Bickley claimed, doubtless with exaggeration, that the "brains" of the South, all slave state governors save three, several members of the Buchanan cabinet, and a total of sixty-five thousand Southerners were members of the Knights.<sup>72</sup> Although such assertions were promptly denied, they gave color then and later to Northern charges of Southern aggression and conspiracy.<sup>73</sup>

The close of the summer saw General Bickley working his way toward the Southwest.<sup>74</sup> Perhaps conscious of criticism of his delay in initiating a real military movement across the Rio Grande, he frequently apologized for his apparent failure and assured his public that the invasion would take place at a later date. Among the reasons cited for delay were the discouraging fate of General William Walker in Honduras, the silence of the American government on British intervention in Mexico and Central America, the difficulties of transporting large numbers of men and materials across country, the failure of ammunition to arrive on schedule, and the approaching presidential election.<sup>75</sup> Indeed it appears that explanations were very much in order, as announcements had proclaimed the actual beginning of the invasion as early as January, often giving numbers en route, officers in charge.

<sup>71</sup> Richmond *Daily Whig*, July 18, 1860.

<sup>72</sup> Nashville *Republican Banner*, Sept. 15, 1860. Opinions differed as to the numbers enrolled in the K. G. C., and it seems impossible to make an accurate statement on this point. Later Bickley claimed 115,000 members. Harrison (Texas) *Flag*, Nov. 17, 1860.

<sup>73</sup> The K. G. C. "prepared and ripened its members for the task of treason". Horace Greeley, *The American Conflict* (2 vols., Hartford, 1867), I, 350; the New York *Tribune*, Mar. 31, 1860, advanced the conspiracy theory. See also Orville J. Victor, *The History, Civil, Political, and Military of the Southern Rebellion* (4 vols., New York, 1861-68?), I, 135-36. Parson Brownlow vigorously denied membership. Knoxville *Whig*, Sept. 15, 1860.

<sup>74</sup> Alexandria *Gazette*, Sept. 4, 1860.

<sup>75</sup> Letter of Bickley to the Galveston *News* in the New Orleans *Daily Picayune*, Oct. 26, 1860. Walker was executed on September 12, 1860, by Honduran authorities. *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIX, 363-65.

destinations, and other details.<sup>76</sup> At first these alleged movements were taken seriously, but as no well co-ordinated army appeared on the Rio Grande, increasing skepticism was voiced. A biting sarcastic denunciation of Bickley appeared in the St. Louis *Sunday Morning Republican*, July 29, 1860, written by a New Orleans correspondent, which denied the existence of a K. G. C. camp in Texas and expressed wonder that intelligent people could be deceived by "that arrant knave and unmitigated humbug, 'General' Bickley". Unquestionably many prospective adventurers did proceed to the Mexican border, but no farther, and before the end of the year turned back in disillusionment to their homes, sadder but wiser, it may be hoped.<sup>77</sup> The chief responsibility for the collapse of the movement rests with Bickley, and probably the Corpus Christi *Ranchero* was correct in saying that mismanagement on the part of the K. G. C. leaders was apparent.<sup>78</sup> In spite of his lack of tangible accomplishment the irrepressible leader was now ready for new ventures and from his headquarters at San Antonio, Texas, prepared to utilize the K. G. C. as a secessionist auxiliary. At the end of October General Bickley addressed the people of Austin as to the role of the K. G. C. in the crisis which was approaching. He advised the election of Bell, Douglas, or Breckinridge, and although he disavowed disunion objects, he declared that there were but two parties, Northern and Southern, and that if Lincoln were elected, the K. G. C. would become a rallying army for secessionists. Judge Paschal, a Bell elector, inquired whether the K. G. C. oath was above or subordinate to the Constitution and laws of the land and, further, whether members assumed to themselves the power to determine the constitutionality of laws of Congress or recognized the lawful tribunals of the country. General Bickley replied that "as citizens we judge of the Constitutionality of the laws and act accordingly". The Breckinridge electors present were said to have applauded this answer "vociferously".<sup>79</sup>

Judge Paschal then asked about the activity of the order as a police

<sup>76</sup> The New York correspondent of the *Charleston Mercury* declared that 1,500 men had left New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore by land and sea and that 8,500 Knights were at New Orleans, "ready to go". Norfolk *Southern Argus*, Jan. 27, 1860; Alexandria *Gazette*, Sept. 4, 1860.

<sup>77</sup> The K. G. C. on the border may be followed in the New Orleans *Daily Crescent*, Apr. 25, May 8, 9, 12, 26, June 2, 14, July 2, Aug. 20, Oct. 16, 1860. The Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, Oct. 1, 1860, reported two thousand K. G. C. on the banks of the Rio Grande under Major General G. W. Bickley and General Greer.

<sup>78</sup> San Antonio *Ledger and Texan*, Oct. 13, 1860.

<sup>79</sup> Austin *Southern Intelligencer* in the LaGrange (Texas) *True Issue*, Nov. 1, 1860.

force. He said that he understood that it was acting as spies on travelers "and *even marks* baggage". This Bickley acknowledged to be true, whereupon Paschal denounced the order's police activity as worse than Know-Nothingism, as "an order of Robespierre, which would plunge us into revolution". This critic, however, had no objection to the Mexican objectives of the K. G. C., because he himself desired to see "every foot of Mexico" under the American flag.<sup>80</sup> There can be no doubt that Bickley was in congenial company among the Texans, who approved his fighting talk, whether directed against Mexicans or Yankees.<sup>81</sup> Whatever Bickley's role in the presidential election in Texas, the Breckinridge press was favorable to the Knights.<sup>82</sup>

One other aspect of the K. G. C. activity in Texas may be of interest. Walter P. Webb has described Governor Sam Houston's threefold "Grand Plan", by which he would annex all of Mexico, settle the sectional controversy, and make himself President of the United States.<sup>83</sup> It will be noted that Bickley's plan embraced the first two of these points, and indeed many thought that Houston was the head of the K. G. C. Although this was apparently untrue, in the fall of 1860 a Virginia officer of the K. G. C. wrote to the Norfolk *Southern Argus* describing an interview which, he said, was attended by Governor Houston, General Bickley, and himself. Houston assured the group that if Spain "made a hostile demonstration at Vera Cruz", he and his Texans with "other volunteers" would cross the Rio Grande. This writer asserted that affairs on the border, in Mexico, and in the South were of such a critical nature that there should be no surprise if soldiers were soon "swarming on both sides of the Rio Grande, struggling for a country which furnishes the South an outlet for her institutions".<sup>84</sup> The election of Lincoln, however, ended the community of interest between Houston and the Knights if such ever existed. The K. G. C. continued secessionist and Confederate activity through the early months of 1861. A convention of Knights was held at San Antonio on February 22, 1861, at which their services were tendered to the state of

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>81</sup> Charleston *Mercury*, Nov. 1, 1860; Alfred M. Williams, *Sam Houston and the War of Independence in Texas* (Boston, 1893), pp. 333-34; R. H. Williams, *With the Border Ruffians*, ed. by E. W. Williams (New York, 1907), pp. 158-64.

<sup>82</sup> The Charleston *Mercury*, Nov. 1, 1860, said that only a remnant of old Whigs opposed the Knights.

<sup>83</sup> Webb, p. 203. Webb does not mention Bickley.

<sup>84</sup> Macon *Georgia Journal and Messenger*, Nov. 7, 1860. The officer was probably Colonel Virginius D. Groner of Norfolk, who was traveling at that time with Bickley. Marshall *Texas Republican*, Nov. 17, 1860.

Texas. Persons who attended reported the order to be in a flourishing condition, and it was said that there were eight thousand members in the state.<sup>85</sup>

After the outbreak of the Civil War, Northerners recalled the antebellum plots of the K. G. C. in Texas. In 1862 General Mansfield told Secretary Salmon P. Chase that he had been in Texas during the winter of 1860-61 and that the K. G. C. had been very active. Mansfield had learned from a K. G. C. officer there of a plot to seize Washington and to inaugurate Breckinridge. Floyd, Cobb, Breckinridge, and Jefferson Davis were members, he was told.<sup>86</sup>

Space will not permit here a detailed consideration of the subsequent career of the amazing Bickley, but a few words may suffice to describe the concluding phases of his life. Leaving Texas, a state safe for the Confederacy, late in 1860 or early in 1861, he turned to secessionist propaganda and military organization in the border states of Tennessee and Kentucky. He evidently visited Montgomery, the Confederate capital, as the correspondent of the *London Times*, William H. Russell, who was in Montgomery in May, 1861, commented: "I hear a good deal about the association called the Knights of the Golden Circle, a Protestant Association for securing the Gulf provinces and states, including—which has been largely developed by recent events—them in the Southern Confederacy, and creating them into an independent government."<sup>87</sup> It will be recalled that this was one of the original proposals of the Knights as enunciated by Bickley.

More pressing matters, however, awaited him in Kentucky, a state hanging in the balance between the Union and the Confederacy, and the trail of the elusive ex-filibuster may next be followed in the vicinity of Clarksville, Tennessee, and Russellville, Kentucky, where there were concentrations of troops for Confederate service. At last, opportunity actually to fight was about to present itself to the warlike general, who thus far had fought all his battles in the press or in the forum. The organizing and recruiting work soon attracted the notice of Unionist members of the Kentucky legislature, into which were introduced

<sup>85</sup> Colorado (Texas) *Citizen* in the *LaGrange True Issue*, Mar. 14, 1861.

<sup>86</sup> *Diary of Salmon P. Chase, July 21, 1862, to October 12, 1862, Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1902* (2 vols., Washington, 1903), II, 70. See also Greeley, II, 18-19; John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Abraham Lincoln: A History* (10 vols., New York, 1890), IV, 181.

<sup>87</sup> William H. Russell, *My Diary North and South* (2 vols., London, 1863), I, 238. Members were officially notified on February 1, 1861, that after March 1, 1861, the general headquarters of the K. G. C. would be Montgomery. San Antonio *Herald* in the Dallas (Texas) *Herald*, Feb. 20, 1861.



resolutions calling for an investigation of the K. G. C. But such was unnecessary, as Bickley's ever-ready pen produced "An Open Letter to the Kentucky Legislature", phrased in characteristic style, which defied his critics by the publication of the first and second degrees of the K. G. C. He claimed eight thousand members distributed in every county of the state and boldly announced that his work would continue vigorously till the Confederate flag flew triumphantly over the capitol at Frankfort.<sup>88</sup> Naturally this aroused the Unionist *Louisville Journal* to combat the subversive movement. Editorially this paper compared Bickley to Catiline, assailed his "incendiary doctrines and hellish machinations",<sup>89</sup> and later characterized the K. G. C. as "the very heart, the brain, the breath, the soul of the Secession party in Kentucky".<sup>90</sup> In lighter vein the same paper lampooned "King Bickley, Monarch of the K. G. C.", and humorously observed in a witticism redolent of George D. Prentice, "Many a man who puts his foot in a golden circle may get his neck in a hempen one."<sup>91</sup> Events were to prove that once again Bickley had enlisted in an unsuccessful cause; although many in Kentucky sympathized with the Confederacy and joined the armies of the South, Union sentiment ultimately prevailed in the state. Bickley concluded this chapter of his life on a carping and complaining note; in a letter to the *Clarksville Chronicle* he charged unfair treatment by the state of Tennessee, disbanded his men, and sent them to their homes.<sup>92</sup>

Probably the K. G. C. organization spread across the Ohio River into Indiana and other states of the Old Northwest, where the order won an unsavory reputation during the course of the Civil War. But apparently Bickley was not concerned in this later and more famous development of the order which he founded, an antiwar organization which caused the Lincoln administration some anxious moments and was investigated by the Federal government in an effort to suppress its activities and imprison its members.<sup>93</sup>

<sup>88</sup> *Louisville Daily Courier*, May 20, 1861.

<sup>89</sup> *Louisville Daily Journal*, June 4, 1861.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, July 20, 1861.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, June 8, Aug. 14, 1861. Prentice was editor of the *Louisville Journal*.

<sup>92</sup> *Clarksville Chronicle*, Aug. 2, 1861. In spite of his treatment he pledged continued loyalty to the principles and cause of the South.

<sup>93</sup> A point which needs clarification is the relationship of Bickley's order to that existing in the North, 1862-64. James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850* (7 vols., New York, 1900-1906), V, 317-18, does not mention the Southern phase of the order. An investigation during the Civil War in Indiana disclosed the Southern and filibustering origins. *Cincinnati Daily Commercial*, Aug. 5, 1862. Mayo Fesler, "Secret Political Societies in the North during the Civil War", *Indiana Magazine of History*, XIV (Sept., 1918), 183-286, a pioneer scholarly investigation, discussed, pp.

Never again did Bickley win the notoriety that was his during 1860-61, and after the Kentucky-Tennessee episode it is at times difficult to trace him. From his old haunts in southwest Virginia the erstwhile general wrote to Governor John Letcher, early in 1862, informing him that he was raising a battalion of light dragoons in Lee, Scott, Russell, and Wise counties and requesting assistance in the form of supplies from either the state of Virginia or the Confederate States.<sup>94</sup> No other record of this organization has been found, and it is probable that its fate was similar to that of other projects begun by Bickley. The next evidence reveals him resuming the medical role, which he had once renounced for more romantic diversions, as surgeon in General Bragg's army,<sup>95</sup> and on June 10, 1863, he signed a voucher for pay from January 28 to June 9, 1863, as surgeon, 29th North Carolina Regiment.<sup>96</sup>

For reasons which are not apparent the Confederate surgeon applied for and received a pass through Union lines with the understanding that he would proceed directly to his erstwhile home in Cincinnati. Immediately suspicious of Bickley, General Rosecrans permitted him to come to headquarters near Tullahoma, Tennessee, for questioning. Confronted with the charge that he was "the famous General Bickley", he denied it stoutly, maintaining that he was the nephew of the general and that he could prove it in Cincinnati, a contention to which he persistently adhered throughout his imprisonment. Perhaps the plausibility of the man may be grasped in the fact that his tale of suffering so won the sympathy of the officers at headquarters that they lent him sixty dollars in addition to ten dollars which he had already borrowed when he first made contact with the Union men. Bickley was paroled and ordered to report to General Burnside in Cincinnati for identification, but General Rosecrans took the precaution of placing a detective on the train with the good doctor. Arriving at Louisville, Bickley es-

---

183-99, Bickley and the K. G. C. movement, based largely on the Bickley Papers. Fesler attempted to ascertain the time and manner of the introduction of the order into the border states north of the Ohio but arrived at no convincing conclusions. *Ibid.*, pp. 199-200. Eli Kinney, Bickley's brother-in-law, testified in 1863 that Bickley had established a K. G. C. castle at Portsmouth, Ohio, before the war. MS., Bickley Papers. Of course after his capture Bickley emphatically denied connection with the Northern K. G. C., or Order of American Knights, as they were later called. Columbus (Ohio) *Crisis*, Dec. 30, 1863.

<sup>94</sup> Bickley to John Letcher, Feb. 3, 1862. MS. in the office of the Adjutant General, Washington, D. C. Copy in possession of the author.

<sup>95</sup> Special Order No. 23, Adjutant and Inspector General's Office, Richmond, Jan. 28, 1863. MS., Bickley Papers.

<sup>96</sup> Major General James F. McKinley, Adjutant General, to the author. July 23, 1934.

caped to New Albany, Indiana, instead of proceeding to Cincinnati as ordered, and "commenced putting himself *en rapport* with the Knights of the Golden Circle". Under close surveillance, he was permitted a day or two of freedom, then was arrested, and his baggage searched. In his trunk were found incriminating documents which proved him to be "the great modern knight himself, and nobody else".<sup>97</sup>

Further investigation proved to the satisfaction of Northern authorities that the prisoner was the original and notorious General Bickley.<sup>98</sup> He was characterized by the press as "Morgan's spy", and indeed it was a suspicious fact that his movements were apparently timed to coincide with General John H. Morgan's famous raid into Indiana and Ohio.<sup>99</sup> It may have been that Bickley intended to secure aid for Morgan from the Knights in the Northwest. If this was his plan, his arrest summarily terminated it, and on August 18, 1863, he was remanded to prison in the Ohio Penitentiary in Columbus, where, despite his complaints, he was kept in solitary confinement. He was later transferred to Fort Lafayette and finally to Fort Warren, from which place he was released in the fall of 1865.<sup>100</sup>

While in prison, he bombarded officials of state and national governments with his pleas for trial, denial of guilt, and demands for release.<sup>101</sup> But his efforts were in vain, because the Lincoln administration was convinced that he was a dangerous man, and not until some

<sup>97</sup> Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, July 22, 1863. This account was captioned "The Great Mogul of the Knights of the Golden Circle in Captivity". This paper considered him to be the active head of the K. G. C. in the West. For Bickley's arrest and a description of the papers found in his trunk see the New Albany *Daily Ledger*, July 18, 1863. The seized papers are now in the Office of the Judge Advocate General, Washington, D. C.

<sup>98</sup> See the statement of Eli Kinney and Daniel K. Cadz, "In re Case of G. W. L. Bickley". MS., Bickley Papers.

<sup>99</sup> Indianapolis *Daily Journal*, July 22, 1863; the Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, July 22, 1863, asserted that Bickley would be tried as a spy and possibly put to death. An important review of the case by Larz Anderson revealed suspicion that Bickley's visit north at the time of his arrest was in connection with the Morgan raid and concluded that "his character . . . is that of a very accomplished, uncommonly plausible, and utterly untrustworthy individual". Larz Anderson to General N. C. McLean, Feb. 6, 1864. MS., Bickley Papers. For a brief account of Morgan's raid see Rhodes, V, 313-15.

<sup>100</sup> Record of G. W. L. Bickley's imprisonment. MS., Bickley Papers. For his protests against his treatment at the Ohio penitentiary see the Columbus (Ohio) *Crisis*, Dec. 30, 1863.

<sup>101</sup> For Bickley's case see Statement B, written by him and later sent to Secretary Seward. MS., Bickley Papers. See also Bickley to C. A. Dana, Sept. 9, 1864; Bickley to Stanton, Jan. 16, 1865; Bickley to Major General John A. Dix, May 5, 1864. MSS., Bickley Papers.

months after Appomattox was he at last released, after signing an oath of amnesty on October 14, 1865.<sup>102</sup> Deeply discredited everywhere and odious because of his association with the Knights of the Golden Circle,<sup>103</sup> after his imprisonment he was plunged into an oblivion from which he did not emerge during the brief remainder of life left to him. He is said to have lectured in England on the subject of the American Civil War, in which he had played so inglorious a part.<sup>104</sup> Even in Cincinnati he was so quickly forgotten that shortly after his death, on August 10, 1867, the Cincinnati *Daily Commercial* made only the laconic announcement: "G. W. T. [*sic*] Bickley died in Baltimore on Saturday. Bickley flourished in Cincinnati fourteen or fifteen years ago."<sup>105</sup> Thus passed from the earthly scene a man to whom, it was said, the title of adventurer belonged more properly than to any other American.<sup>106</sup>

### III

The Knights of the Golden Circle, considered as an abortive Southern filibustering movement, appear to be of significance to the historian of the United States for their contribution to further sectional misunderstanding. It must be emphasized that emotional feeling in the North and South rose to fever heat during 1860. In the summer of that year "fiendish abolitionist plots" were "discovered" and publicized, and no doubt Northerners who chanced to read Bickley's incendiary manifestoes were strengthened in their hostility to the South. Senator James R. Doolittle of Wisconsin discussed in the Senate what he termed "Southern fanaticism's" solution of the slavery question. That solution looked to the

acquisition of Cuba, Mexico, Central America, all tropical America . . . the reopening of the African slave trade direct with Africa, as well as with the old slave-producing States of the United States, for the double purpose of planting slavery throughout the whole of that region, until, extending across

<sup>102</sup> Records in the office of the Adjutant General, Washington, D. C. Major General James F. McKinley to the author, July 23, 1934.

<sup>103</sup> See a curious contemporary cartoon which held the K. G. C. doctrines responsible for the assassination of Lincoln. James Truslow Adams, *The March of Democracy* (2 vols., New York, 1932-33), II, opp. p. 115. It is difficult to believe that Bickley was involved in that crime.

<sup>104</sup> Felter, p. 111.

<sup>105</sup> Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, Aug. 16, 1867; Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, Aug. 16, 1867.

<sup>106</sup> Abingdon *Virginian*, Oct. 4, 1867, reprinted in Felter, p. 112.

all Central America and tropical America, it shakes hands with the empire of Brazil, and at the same time bringing into this Union millions upon millions of the mixed races, for the purpose of counterbalancing the growing power, politically and otherwise, of the great Caucasian race in the North and the West. Call this solution by what name you please—the solution of Walker and his filibusters; the solution of the slave propagandists, or of the Knights of the Golden Circle.<sup>107</sup>

Not all Northerners, however, shared Doolittle's apprehension. Halstead's Cincinnati *Daily Commercial* mercilessly satirized Bickley in a humorous review of his career. He would invade Mexico, said the *Commercial*, "carrying the Bible, the pocket-pistol, negro slavery and other blessings of civilization" in his train. Concerning his protestations of respectability the question was posed, "Is he not an F. F. V. and a gentleman?" Patrick Henry's words were paraphrased in Bickley's mouth: "Give me Mexico, or give me death!" After which the *Commercial* affirmed that the collection box was passed.<sup>108</sup> Another Republican organ in the same city looked with favor on a move which would bring Mexico under American control, disregarding the danger of slave expansion.<sup>109</sup>

Possibly some of the Northern alarm was of a political nature, for the campaign of 1860 was in progress. Earlier the New York *Tribune* had expressed no qualms on the score of slave extension across the Rio Grande, because climate and topography would prevent it. Buchanan's Mexican policy would have been more comprehensible to the *Tribune* if northern Mexico afforded any hope of adding slave states to the Union. Slavery needed fertile soil, staple crops, and facilities for transportation. Northern Mexico had little soil suitable for the cultivation of cotton or sugar, nor were there navigable rivers or harbors for satisfactory transportation. So sanguine was this eminent Republican newspaper that it doubted if even the revival of the African slave trade could establish slave labor there.<sup>110</sup> Moreover, the Lincoln administration would deal a *coup de grâce* to such filibusters as Bickley.<sup>111</sup>

<sup>107</sup> *Congressional Globe*, 36 Cong., 1 sess., pt. II, p. 1632. Apparently the Southern members allowed the allusion to the K. G. C. to pass unanswered. The congressional spokesman for the K. G. C. in 1860 was Representative S. S. Cox of Cincinnati, an ardent exponent of Manifest Destiny. For his speech supporting the order see *ibid.*, pp. 1238-45.

<sup>108</sup> Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, Apr. 6, July 30, 1860.

<sup>109</sup> Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, Mar. 26, 1860.

<sup>110</sup> New York *Tribune*, Nov. 22, 1859.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, Mar. 31, 1860, did not think much could be achieved by the K. G. C. before November, when a new order would begin in Washington which would "restrain the ardor of these gentlemen of medieval propensities".

Clearly a fundamental divergence existed as to geographical fact. Was Bickley correct in his belief that he could build a slave empire in Mexico, or was the *Tribune* right in assuming that natural laws would inexorably halt the expansion of slavery in that quarter? Contemporary leaders like Douglas and Crittenden agreed with the *Tribune* on this point. Congressman John H. Reagan of Texas was of the same opinion. He wrote in 1858:

I know you will shrink back at the idea that slavery may thus be well nigh circumscribed. But we must look at destiny as it is, not as we would have it. You would make slave States then, so would I, and we would make a slave State of Kansas, of New Mexico, of Utah, *but we cannot*, as we did not in California. I see the last State Gazette wants Sonora. For what, in God's name. To make another free State? For that is the inevitable.<sup>112</sup>

Charles W. Ramsdell, a modern scholar, has projected the discussion into the twentieth century by his contention that the geographical limits of slave extension had been reached by 1860 and that there was no further land within the confines of the United States, or contiguous to it, where slavery could be established.<sup>113</sup>

All of which bears on the problem of Lincoln's historic decision to reject the Crittenden Compromise in 1860-61. Lincoln and some of the Republicans were strongly of the belief that the question of slave extension must needs be definitively settled. They felt that if Crittenden's measures were adopted, filibustering for all the lands to the southward would be a constant problem, with the probability that more concessions would be demanded by the South as a condition of remaining in the Union. Later Lincoln wrote that the only "compromise" acceptable to him would be a prohibition of the acquisition of any more territory whatsoever. Would not the South soon demand Cuba, Mexico, and Central America?<sup>114</sup> There is no evidence that Lincoln knew of the K. G. C., the last of the ante-bellum filibustering movements, but as he is known to have been a careful reader of newspapers, it is possible that he was cognizant of Bickley's Knights and that he had in mind such activity as theirs when he declined to accept the Crittenden Compromise.

<sup>112</sup> John H. Reagan to J. W. Latimore, Oct. 7, 1858. MS., Reagan Papers, Austin, Texas. Senator Louis T. Wigfall of Texas was another in that state who disapproved of the seizure of Mexico. Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, Mar. 1, 1860.

<sup>113</sup> Charles W. Ramsdell, "The Natural Limits of Slave Extension", *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, XVI (Sept., 1929), 151-71.

<sup>114</sup> Rhodes, III, 168-70, 264.

Avery Craven has observed, regarding the coming of the Civil War, that overwrought emotions led to sectional hatred, which in turn produced "mythical devils". The people of the North and the South had heard and read so much misrepresentation that they "knew little of each other as realities".<sup>115</sup> Given the current state of mind on the eve of the war, it is probable that the blatant Bickley and his Knights of the Golden Circle became just such hated symbols of evil in the crisis of 1860-61.

OLLINGER CRENSHAW.

*Washington and Lee University.*

<sup>115</sup> Avery Craven, "Coming of the War between the States: An Interpretation", *Journal of Southern History*, II (Aug., 1936), 303-22.



## WHO ELECTED LINCOLN?\*

ON November 7, 1860, the day after Lincoln's election, a New York *Times* reporter "searched in vain for someone that could tell us the feelings of the defeated. Everyone declared himself a Lincoln man or else said nothing." Today, fourscore years later, the descendants of those who then kept silent, or most of them, in New York and throughout the North, boast of their forebears' attachment to the "rail-splitter's" cause. And as with individuals, so with groups. Lincoln's election was accomplished, each major element representing that day's citizenship would have the world know, largely if not absolutely because of the prescience of its group in pinning faith upon the homely Illinois statesman.

The honest pride and satisfaction of the Norwegians in the thought that their people, though not then numerous, nearly all "voted right" in 1860 is to this day a vital element in that people's public morale. The same can be said of the Welsh, English, and Scotch, but the Irish, being then as now Catholics and in that era bedeviled by animosities peculiar to the adherents of that religion, are perhaps the only English-speaking contingent which has never claimed credit for sending Lincoln to the White House. This is due not to the inherent modesty of the race but rather to the persistence of its Democracy and reluctance to acknowledge an early error.

On the other hand, by a queer distortion of both logic and history it has often been sought to include the Catholic Germans among the hosts of Lincoln electors. And taken as a body, the Germans have so skillfully and persistently pressed their claims that historians of all shades of opinion as to Lincoln and of the most diverse traditions have seemed eager to endorse the German contention without analysis or criticism. Thus we read in staunch Republican writers of Yankee lineage that the Germans in 1860 rushed to the aid of the antislavery forces, while at the same time Southern "revisionists", seeking a scapegoat, find it in the fact that the black Republicans won success only with the aid of a multitude of alien, especially German, voters.

Carl Schurz is universally acknowledged to have been the leading

\*Dr. Joseph Schafer was long interested in the problem of who elected Lincoln in 1860. In the present article, which he submitted to the *Review* shortly before his death, he addressed himself to one phase of this question.

German campaigner for Lincoln. As a member of the Republican National Committee from Wisconsin he was given charge of the "foreign department" and promptly analyzed the problem confronting him, which was to secure speakers and arrange meetings in all the non-English-speaking communities. He was the logical man for the function to be performed, for it was Schurz who—more than any other Republican—had shown himself the foreigners' defender against the onslaught of nativism, hateful to all foreigners and doubly repellent to Catholics in the alien groups.

In the spring of 1859 he had given out a brilliant utterance on that theme from the sacred precincts of Faneuil Hall. Again, at the Chicago National Republican Convention Schurz, as a member of the resolutions committee, insisted on a clean-cut antinativist declaration in the platform on which the Republican candidate was to appeal to the electorate. He was determined to omit nothing that could in any measure offset the serious handicap of the acknowledged infestation of the Republican party by Know-Nothings.

Having made all preparations, he sallied forth as the most ubiquitous as well as the ablest speaker in the German language, if not as the ablest Republican campaigner in English also. He invaded the "October" states—Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana—and they gave an encouraging account of themselves. He then campaigned in those states once more to guarantee the result and also spoke famously in English at St. Louis to the slaveholders, while at Cooper Union he castigated Douglas, also in English; then he traversed New York State, visited Illinois, and wound up his Herculean labors with a series of speeches in Milwaukee and throughout the German communities along Lake Michigan.

Schurz was never overmodest about telling what he thought of his own achievements, and some of the letters he wrote during the campaign, had they not been intimate recitals of his prowess to his wife, could be criticized by faultfinders as unblushingly boastful. It would hardly be fair to quote them as representative of his considered opinion. On September 24, 1863, however, he wrote to Theodore Petrasch, whom he had not seen or heard from since their university days in 1848, telling about his part in American political affairs:

My activities were very extended and had a large and direct influence upon the political development of the country. I have been told that I made Lincoln president. That is, of course, not true, but that people say so indi-

cates that I contributed something toward raising the breeze which carried Lincoln into the presidential chair and thereby shook slavery in its foundations.<sup>1</sup>

The idea that he made Lincoln president, which, though he seemingly waved it from him after giving it utterance, he obviously delighted to entertain, could rest only on the theory that he had been instrumental in converting to Republicanism a large, and in some states a controlling, proportion of German Democrats, for with few exceptions his speeches were made in German to audiences made up of Germans. The argument is, therefore, that it was the Germans who elected Lincoln and that Schurz, as the leading campaigner in their language, was responsible for the dominantly Republican German vote. Hence he was the man who made Lincoln president.

A sample of the reasoning on which extravagant Germanists rely is seen in the book called *Wisconsin's Deutsch Amerikaner*, published at Milwaukee in 1900 and written by a versatile German named Wilhelm Hense-Jensen. "The breach in the national Democratic party", he says, "which before the election divided into two factions, and more yet, the support of the immigrant vote, led in the year 1860 to the election of Abraham Lincoln." He followed the generalization with what he considered proof of the Germans' agency in giving Lincoln a better than 20,000 majority in Wisconsin:

In Wisconsin 86,113 votes were cast for Lincoln. The percentage of inhabitants in the state who were of German derivation (born in Germany or of German-born parents) was at that time the highest it was ever to show. It amounted, according to careful and credible compilation, to 69 per cent of the entire population. Accepting this percentage and assuming further that only two thirds of the voters of German derivation voted the Republican ticket, the conclusion is reached that at least 40,000 German voters in Wisconsin voted for Lincoln.

If 40,000 voted for Lincoln and that was two thirds of the German voting strength, then the Germans were of course responsible for the Lincoln majority over Douglas of a few more than 20,000 votes. Naturally, Hense-Jensen glories in his people's supposed noble achievement. "The German population", he proclaims, "had once more fulfilled its original mission. For, whithersoever the German directed his steps, everywhere it appeared to be his function to open the way for freedom."

His conclusions, however, were reached with such suspicious facility

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Schafer, tr. and ed., *Intimate Letters of Carl Schurz, 1841-1869*, Publications of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Collections, XXX (Madison, 1928), 284.

as to challenge a careful scrutiny and analysis. The result is a very different picture from that which is here presented in that author's own language turned into English.

In the first place, we would like to be clear on how he discovered that Germans constituted 69 per cent of the state's population in 1860, particularly since by reading forward to the chapter describing the participation of Germans in the Civil War, he is caught using an entirely different yardstick for measuring, from the very same census returns, the German element of the population. Instead of 69 per cent, for military purposes that element mysteriously shrinks to about 16 per cent. This enables him to prove that his countrymen exceeded their quota in the military effort made by the state.

In view of this showing it is not imperatively necessary to pay much attention to the figures given above, either for German Lincoln voters or for German Lincoln soldiers. We believe that the Germans of Wisconsin did their full duty in the war and that their number was approximately one sixth of all the men sent to the front by the state.

It is not remarkable, therefore, to discover from the census that the German-born citizens in 1860 constituted almost exactly one sixth of the state's total population. If we had to deal only with the German born, our task would be simple, for the number of those is clearly set forth in the census. A good argument could be made for disregarding their native-born children, on two grounds: first, that there were few if any voters, at least among those born in Wisconsin; second, if in some states like Ohio there were native-born voters of German parentage, they would be quite as apt to vote against as with the older generation of Germans, for they had lost much of the racial feeling. However, for convenience in computing the total number of German voters, under the well-established rule of one to every five of the population, some approximation to the number of natives of German parentage should be found. For Wisconsin, as stated, we find the German born to be one sixth of the aggregate population.

Were we to assign to that group one sixth of the natives born in Wisconsin, that would add a third to the number of Germans. The proportion would manifestly be overgenerous because the majority of the German born whose numbers are definitely ascertained by the census entered the country only a few years prior to 1860, while other population groups, like the Yankees, had been present in force for many years and contributed much more heavily to the aggregate of the native born. Nevertheless, since it is practically impossible to determine how

many native-born children any given group was responsible for, let us assume, for convenience, that in the case of the Germans the native children equaled one third of the German born, which would be one sixth of all Wisconsin native born. The same one third rule may be applied when we come to consider the German element in other states, though it cannot be regarded as other than an estimate, sometimes too large, as in Wisconsin, occasionally perhaps a bit too small.

Wisconsin in 1860 had 123,879 German born in her population. Adding 41,196, which equals one sixth of the entire native group and is about 100 less than one third of the German born, we have 165,075. Since one in five could be a voter, the potential voting strength of the German aggregation was 33,015 instead of 60,000, as Hense-Jensen estimated it. If, with him, we assign to Lincoln two thirds of that vote, he would have received 22,010 votes. But, in that case, 11,005 must have voted the Democratic ticket, leaving the Germans far short of providing Lincoln's 20,000 majority. The extent of the Republican majority can by no stretch of the facts be attributed to German votes even under the assumption that two thirds of them went to Lincoln.

Our crucial question now is: Did two thirds of the German voters in 1860 cast their ballots for Abraham Lincoln? We are arrived at the point where the "grass roots" population studies carried out under the Wisconsin Domesday Book project, a superior "Gallup poll" covering the time in question, begin to apply in significant ways to the consideration of a problem of nation-wide import which hitherto has always been treated as a subject for vague speculation or sheer guesswork. Several of the most "German" counties in Wisconsin have been studied socially by townships, which were also the election precincts, in order to discover how the several social groups voted in the two presidential elections of 1856 and 1860.

What can the speculative historian oppose to facts like these: The town of Marshfield, in Fond du Lac County, in 1860, by careful hand count of the manuscript census entries, had 239 family heads, of whom 229 were German and 10 non-German. The vote, as recorded for that precinct in the Wisconsin *Blue Book*, is Lincoln 6, Douglas 193. Another case: The town of Cedarburg, in Ozaukee County, had 229 German family heads and 111 Irish. There were only 7 who did not belong to those two groups. In that town the vote was Lincoln 7, Douglas 299! Can there be any question as to what groups were voting against Lincoln?

Now contrast the following case. In the town of Rosendale, Fond

du Lac County, were 211 family heads, of whom 140 were native American, 15 English, 1 Scotch, 15 Welsh, and 12 British American. There were only 12 Irish family heads and 16 German. That town recorded a vote of 215 for Lincoln, 22 for Douglas. Can there be much doubt as to what groups in that town were casting votes in Lincoln's favor? Nearly, if not quite all, must have been given by the American and British family heads and their connections, such as the superannuated men of the households, hired men, *et al.* It is known that a good many Germans were still shy about voting, though the Irish were not. The town of Emmet, in Dodge County, had 180 Irish and German family heads, practically an equal number of each, against 34 Americans, 9 English, 13 Welsh, and 1 British American—total 57. The vote was Lincoln 55, Douglas 155.

Marshfield, Cedarburg, and Emmet were in large part Catholic towns, though the bulk of Cedarburg's Germans were Protestants, and the voting records suggest that Catholic Germans and Catholic Irish were very nearly if not quite unanimous in their opposition to Lincoln. In fact, from the above and many other test cases it can be affirmed that the Irish of Wisconsin could be counted solidly for the Democratic candidates. The German Catholics were also practically unanimous on the same side. Catholics had not forgotten their ancient enemy, the Nativists or "Know-Nothings", who had now been absorbed by the Republican party. Though that party had adopted a vigorous platform plank denouncing Nativism, Catholics could not trust a party which harbored Know-Nothings. Besides, the Democratic party had always been hospitable to foreigners; they felt that the slavery issue should be left to the slave states to settle, and they would not desert the party in its time of obvious distress.

Non-Catholic Germans present a more complex problem, and we shall see that some precincts in which such persons dominated reported many German votes for Lincoln. The town of Mequon, Ozaukee County, is an example. It had 561 family heads, of whom 459 were German and 30 Irish; that is, 489 of the two groups combined. Americans and British at the census date, June 1, were but 31 all told. Yet the vote of that town stood Lincoln 141, Douglas 314. Inasmuch as the Irish are sure to have voted for Douglas, this means that probably as many as 110 Germans, out of 459, voted for Lincoln. The proportion was not two thirds, nor yet one third, but it may have approximated one fourth.

Other non-Catholic German towns show varying proportions of

Lincoln votes. The town of Herman in Dodge County had 401 family heads, 337 German and 11 Irish. Other groups totaled 53. The vote was 65 for Lincoln, 282 for Douglas. Here we can only say that some—not many—Lincoln votes might have been cast by Germans; although it is not impossible that the 53 non-Germans, re-enforced by a few hired men, could have accounted for the entire Lincoln vote.

A better test of Protestant German voting is afforded by another town of Herman, this one in Sheboygan County. That precinct had 355 family heads, all, without a single exception, born in Germany. It was a colony of German Reformed religionists, most of them from the petty state of Lippe Detmold. It had a vigorous church life and was about to establish a mission school of some reputation. Evidently the moral aspect of the slavery question had made some impression on those people. Four years earlier the town had voted 201 for Buchanan to 27 for Frémont. Now, however, they gave Lincoln 122 and Douglas 210, practically 36 per cent to 64 per cent.

A fairly comprehensive sampling of the Wisconsin election vote of 1860 shows few German communities that were more favorable to Lincoln than the one just discussed. Moreover, it gives convincing evidence that the American born of New England and New York lineage were prevailingly Republican, those of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri derivation largely, though not always mainly, Democratic. Wherever the population was English, Scotch, or Welsh, the vote was preponderantly Republican; and the same was true as respects most of the as yet small Norwegian communities, though some were influenced by Norwegian Democratic leaders to vote for Douglas. But so surely as the tally of the family head count in a precinct comes out as German, Irish, or a combination of those two groups, the majority vote was Democratic.

While some Germans, especially the Forty-eighters and some part of the Lutherans, voted the Republican ticket, that vote in 1860, while larger than in 1856, was still very light. When we recall that Catholics seem to have been nearly unanimous for Douglas, that German people of that faith in Wisconsin were at least as numerous as Lutherans and Reformed combined, and that the German Lutherans, so far as we have canvassed the matter, always showed a strong partiality for Douglas, it would be quite unsafe to assume that the proportion of the German voters who preferred Lincoln was more than one sixth of the whole, which would be considerably less than 6,000. The estimate of 40,000 so confidently published by Hense-Jensen is fantastic.



Looking at the election of 1860 from the national standpoint, the first item one can generalize about with safety is that the canvass for Lincoln involved a moral crusade. Opposition to the institution of slavery on moral grounds had been gradually making itself felt among the nonslaveholders of the North for the better part of a century, and from the time of the Mexican War the sentiment against the further extension of the institution had been growing ever more relentless. Quite naturally, it was the older Americans, especially those of the Puritan tradition, who were most deeply affected by the agelong propaganda against slavery on moral principles, and who were now—when an opportunity seemed to offer in the fateful Democratic split—determined to erect a permanent barrier against its further spread.

The historian Rhodes tersely remarks: "Because slavery was wrong, the great majority of northern people had declared against its extension." He had discussed in the preceding chapter the morals of that period, which, he contended with reason, were better than those of the years following the Civil War. And Carl Schurz, in his *Reminiscences*, asserts:

There has never been in the history of this Republic a political movement in which the moral motive was so strong—indeed, so dominant and decisive. . . . I have been active in many political campaigns, but in none in which the best impulses of human nature were so forceful and effective and aroused the masses to so high a pitch of almost religious fervor.

These testimonies are typical and cannot be disregarded or minimized. They are witnesses to a crusade which had been long coming to a head through the gradual indoctrination of those most susceptible to moral appeals. Of course, the weight of the antislavery propaganda fell upon those who could receive it unhindered by linguistic and other obstacles, which meant the English-speaking-and-reading portion of the population, or at least that dominant fraction of the English-speakers who were not conditioned against it by religious partisanship.

The Irish, being Catholics and having experienced the enmity of the Know-Nothings, now masquerading as Republicans, were effectually prevented from embracing Republican dogmas or supporting Republican candidates, deeply sensitive as that people normally was to the claims of freedom and humanity. The Germans in part were hindered by their adherence to the Catholic Church, and upon the great majority of both Protestants and Catholics the impact of the campaign of education, carried on almost exclusively in English, fell in a mitigated, mangled, and partly ineffectual form. There were some Republican German

newspapers, but their influence was slight as compared with the vastly larger number and greater popularity of the Democratic German papers. It would have been a marvel if, under these circumstances, the Germans could have caught up and kept pace with the psychological movement among American and other English-speaking citizens.

The group of Germans currently described as Forty-eighters, many of whom came to the United States as political refugees after the failure of the '48 revolution, mostly, it is thought, allied themselves with the antislavery forces; at least many of the leaders did so. They were, in the main, educated men, they learned English readily, and they quickly grasped the fundamentals of the antislavery problem as affecting American politics. In the campaign of 1860 men of that group performed yeoman service in propagandizing the German element. Carl Schurz, Gustav Koerner, Franz Hoffmann, Hecker, Stallo, and others threw themselves unreservedly into the campaign to elect Lincoln.

Their work bore fruit, but not nearly as large a harvest as has generally been supposed, and for this there were several reasons. The first is the extreme conservatism of the average German and his loyalty to personal, party, and religious attachments once faithfully established. The second is the skepticism with which German religionists of both groups, Catholic and Protestant, looked upon the revolutionary group, who were not only considered radicals in politics but also, for the most part, anticlericals or outright freethinkers in religion. In a word, the Forty-eighters were in some measure insulated from their religious fellow countrymen and had first to build up among their fellows confidence in themselves before they could hope to detach the mass of the German immigrants from their old political moorings in the friendly Democratic party.

Religion affected the large Lutheran body in still another way. Among Wisconsin churchmen and also those of neighbor states, the powerful intellectual leaders of the Missouri synod, with whom the doctrine that slavery was a biblically justified institution was almost an article of faith, were a strong influence. This proved to be one ground of opposition to that synod's control among Norwegian Lutherans, fierce and eager haters of slavery, but to the Germans it was a stone of stumbling and a cause of intellectual confusion. Time and struggle, especially the Civil War, would bring clarity upon the slavery issue. Then, however, other issues were destined to divide the two parties, and so instead of the Wisconsin Germans having "nearly all" attached themselves to the Republican party by 1856, as one historian unwarily

*affirms*, the majority could not be safely counted for the Republicans until forty years later than the date indicated. To be sure, there were flurries and oscillations during the intervening years, and so far as the cities, especially Milwaukee, were concerned, Republicanism gained a firm control by 1880. Unfortunately for the German claimants, however, probably most Germans were farmers, who were far less amenable to propaganda than the city dwellers. To take a single example, the county of Ozaukee, a few miles north of Milwaukee, a rural county with a heavy preponderance of Germans, gave no Republican presidential candidate a majority prior to the election of 1916; and even then Hughes received only 33 more votes than Wilson.

The campaign directed to the German voters in the hope of bringing them into the Lincoln camp in 1860 was a strenuous one, as anybody can see by reading Carl Schurz's letters written almost day by day during those hectic weeks. The flying squadron of Republican Forty-eighters saved, as brands from the burning, enough Wisconsin German votes to make Lincoln's clear majority about 20,000. But Lincoln would have won in Wisconsin if all German votes had been given to Douglas, as doubtless five sixths of them were.

Where then, it may be asked, did the shift in party allegiance occur which brought success so promptly to the Republican party? The election in 1860 occurred on November 6. From Milwaukee a participant in the Lincoln campaign wrote next day:

When the voting was over, we gathered in the Chamber of Commerce at Spring Street bridge to receive the telegraphed returns. The hall was crowded. As the dispatches arrived the excitement mounted; and when Lincoln's majority appeared ever to be growing the cheering was tremendous. Finally, came New York, the actual battle ground of the campaign. Early dispatches spoke of a majority of 40,000 in the city against us. The stillness of dread among the Republicans! Then the telegrams came, stroke after stroke, and the formidable count melted away, first to 35,000, then 28,000, and finally, 25,000. Everyone breathed freely once more. Then, like a veritable hailstorm, the Republicans reported majorities from the western portion of the state. The crowd went wild with shouts and cheering; hats were flying to the ceiling, against the walls, and to the floor as if they were worth nothing at all. Finally at about two o'clock the telegraph announced: "According to reports received, New York is good for a majority of 50,000." The cannon was now dragged out and we woke up the Democrats, they having withdrawn from the streets pretty early in the evening.

Just as, in Wisconsin, Republican gains between 1856 and 1860 were much more rapid in the Yankee counties than in the counties settled largely by Irish and Germans, so in New York the greatest gains had

been in the upstate region settled mainly from New England. The counties of northeastern Ohio, the old Connecticut reserve, likewise showed distinctly larger gains for free soil than did the counties along the Ohio River, not excluding Hamilton, Cincinnati's county, with its very large German population. Hamilton, indeed, in 1860 gave Lincoln 750 votes more than Douglas but 2,934 less than the combined votes of Douglas and Bell. The 366 votes for Breckinridge have been disregarded in this computation.

A writer in Volume III of the Centennial History of Illinois tells us: "The German vote of Illinois and neighboring states was so powerful in 1860 that without its assistance Lincoln and his party would have been decisively defeated".<sup>2</sup> He obviously takes it for granted that majorities of the Germans in those states supported Lincoln. As already shown, that was not true of the "neighbor" state of Wisconsin, where it is so certain that a large majority of Germans voted for Douglas as to make the Lincoln majority of 20,000 a sure proof of the Germans' inability to alter the result. If all Germans had voted for Douglas, Lincoln would, nevertheless, have won that state.

Let us consider another of the neighbor states, Indiana. Foreign immigration had affected that commonwealth far less than either Illinois or Wisconsin; and the number of those born in Germany was reported in 1860 at 67,000. Applying the test used in our Wisconsin study, which calls for the addition of one third to the German born by reason of the interest of that element in the state's natives of German parentage, we have an aggregate body of 89,000 Germans, who would be represented by 17,800 voters. But the Lincoln majority over Douglas was 24,000, which would have much more than canceled the entire German vote had it been thrown solidly for Douglas.

Ohio's German contingent was much larger, 168,000; adding a third to that number to represent the native-born children, we have a body of 224,000 Germans and a possible 44,800 German voters. But the Lincoln majority over Douglas was 44,378, which doubtless exceeded the entire German vote actually polled. Breckinridge and Bell received a combined vote of 21,600, showing the importance in that state of the Democratic party split.

The case of Michigan is yet more striking. Her small contingent of Germans, not more than 53,500, including the German born and the

<sup>2</sup> Arthur Charles Cole, *The Era of the Civil War* (Springfield, 1919), pp. 341-42. Cf. William E. Dodd, "The Fight for the Northwest, 1860", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XVI (1910-11), 774-88.

American born, could have contained not over 10,700 voters. The Lincoln majority over Douglas, however, was 22,500 and over all Democratic candidates better than 21,000.

We have left one other "neighbor" state of Illinois which proved to be in the Lincoln column after this election—Iowa. There the German contingent was almost precisely equal to that of Michigan—only 38,555, which, corrected to include American-born Germans, yields the aggregate of 51,400, or a body of 10,280 potential German voters. The Lincoln majority in Iowa was over 15,000.

It appears, then, that so far as the "neighbor states" of Illinois were concerned, the generalization with which this discussion began has no facts to sustain it. The case of Illinois itself may be quite different, depending on what detailed research as to group voting by precincts may show with reference to the disposition of Germans to favor Lincoln over Douglas.

If Illinois's German element, in round numbers 131,000 in 1860 and with their American-born children possibly capable of providing a voting strength of nearly 35,000, had voted for Lincoln in two out of three instances, they could have provided the 12,000 majority for him which the final count showed.

It will now be the duty of historical researchers to exhibit the probabilities in this connection. If the number voting for Douglas turns out to equal the number voting for Lincoln, the result of the German vote was, of course, nil. We do not know, as yet, whether Lincoln or Douglas captured the majority of the large German vote of Illinois. But even assuming that the majority, to an extent exceeding 12,000, went to Lincoln—an extremely doubtful assumption in view of the way Germans are known to have voted in Wisconsin—that would merely prove that the German vote was effective in Lincoln's favor in Illinois. The "neighbors" were certainly in the category of states in which the net result was unaffected by the German vote.

It is not known how far, if at all, studies of group preferences, like those included in the Wisconsin Domesday Book series, have been made for the other states. Until such studies will have been made for Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New York, we shall not be in a position either to generalize with complete confidence from the results of the Wisconsin studies or, on the other hand, to refute those findings. But if it should be found, as seems likely to be the case, that Germans elsewhere in the North behaved as did those in the badger state, then we should be able to affirm that so far from the Ger-

mans producing Republican success, it was such success which produced German Republican voters.

If one cared to speculate, there is a possible approach to the question which, while no substitute for the security of the Domesday Book method, may, nevertheless, yield probabilities. The census of 1860 lists the number of churches under the names of the several denominations and gives the estimate of their individual and collective "accommodation". The accommodation would bear a definite relation to the actual customary attendance or those who were subjected to the influence of the spirit of the given sect.

Now in Illinois there were in 1860 churches of the Lutheran denomination which provided accommodation for 33,000 and of the Catholic which provided for 91,000, making together 124,000. But the aggregate accommodation of Presbyterian, Congregational, Methodist, Christian (or Campbellite), Episcopal, and Baptist churches was 534,000. The Presbyterian alone was 128,000, the Baptist 130,000, and the Methodist 267,000. Since the moral leaven of antislavery was working with peculiar activity within some of the American Protestant churches, notwithstanding Lincoln's supposed complaint to Dr. Bateman about the preachers, this affords at least a hint as to where the cauldron may have been in which Republican principles were being brewed.

In any event, it appears all but certain that the assignment of a dominant influence to the foreign born in the election of 1860 is 100 per cent wrong; that Lincoln was elected through an upsurge of moral enthusiasm and determination on the part of the distinctly American folk; and that foreign-born contingents participated, but in no sense as determinative factors.

The author's chief reason for calling sharp attention to the futility of the speculative method hitherto commonly used by historians in dealing with subjects of this kind is to protest against an outworn methodology. The "guessing game" is no longer permissible to those who claim the right to be called historians, in the American field at least. Like Hamlet, we demand "proofs more relative" than those supplied by ghosts.

JOSEPH SCHAFER.

## NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

EPHRAIM BEANLAND AND ZENON OF CAUNUS

A HISTORICAL COMPARISON

IN 1914 some fellaheen who lived near the ancient Ptolemaic-Greek town of Philadelphia in the Fayum in Egypt turned up a large cache of papyri which proved to be the files of a Greek farm overseer of the third century B.C. named Zenon. A native of the Greek town of Caunus in lower Asia Minor, this Zenon first appeared in Egypt in the year 260 B.C. as a young chap bent upon making his fortune. He attached himself to Apollonius, who was treasurer general of Egypt, then the richest country in the world. Despite the importance of his political position and the amazing executive ability that he clearly possessed, Apollonius had dropped entirely out of historical vision until the finding of Zenon's files restored him to a well-earned position of influence in the historical life of his time. To Apollonius a large plot of newly recovered land, some 6,250 acres, had been assigned for development by King Ptolemy II. This land was a part of a greater complex which had but recently been reclaimed from the mud bottom of Lake Moeris by a large-scale drainage engineering project. After several years of disappointing experience with another Greek overseer named Panacestor, Apollonius placed Zenon in charge of the land complex assigned to him. For twelve years Zenon remained in this position until this "grant" to Apollonius, upon the death of Ptolemy II in 246 B.C., reverted to the state.<sup>1</sup> Certainly for nine years longer, possibly for sixteen, Zenon continued to live at Philadelphia as a man well-to-do in his own right and an important local figure by virtue of his connections and his personal ability. Letters and documents continued to come into his hands, many of them dealing with his own diversified business interests, others with the large land grant which he had previously administered, still others with local affairs and problems of the inhabitants of Philadelphia and its surroundings. Fortunately for ancient historians Zenon kept and filed all the papers which came to him, whether related directly to his

<sup>1</sup> Although continued publication of new Zenon finds has necessarily altered some of the details presented by Professor M. I. Rostovtzeff in his *Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C.* (Madison, 1922), his book is still the fundamental study of the Zenon Papyri.



business activities or connected with the interests of his daily life. For example, when a favorite hunting dog of his was killed by a wild boar, he obtained from a poet, presumably a professional at Alexandria, an epitaph for the tombstone of the dead animal. As was his custom, Zenon preserved the original copy sent him by the poet. The epitaph appears on the papyrus in two versions, the first in elegiac verse, the second in iambic.<sup>2</sup> Whether Zenon was to select the one which the better appealed to him or whether both were to be inscribed on the burial stone, as sometimes occurs, we cannot tell.

To many a modern businessman Zenon would seem overmeticulous, possibly ridiculous, in his filing habits. Just as he retained among his papers the encomia upon his dog, so we find his "calendar" lists preserved, the memoranda slips of the duties which lay immediately before him, with his check marks against those items which had been disposed of. So far as purpose was concerned, they were useless when filed. It was not for economy that he kept these—with the idea of using the back of the sheet at a later time. Under the Ptolemaic government monopoly of papyrus manufacture, paper was plentiful and fairly cheap, especially in Egypt. The explanation probably lies in the observation that some people are prone to preserve all letters, bills, and papers that come to their hand. Zenon was one of these.

Upon the surface, at least, there is a marked similarity between the position of Zenon as business manager of the estate of Apollonius and that of the overseers of the plantation owned by James K. Polk in Yalabusha County, Mississippi. In both cases we have numerous letters. A comparison of the context of these two groups of correspondence may be instructive in clarifying the fundamental differences of economic organization and cultural milieu which underlie two historical situations that have, superficially considered, so many points of similarity despite the great disparity in time.

The letters of Polk's overseers, addressed to Polk himself and to Mrs. Polk, cover exactly twenty-five years (1833-58).<sup>3</sup> Zenon documents appear for the twenty-four years 260-237 B.C. (inclusive), with the possibility that Zenon is still mentioned in a tax list of the year 230-229 B.C.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> C. C. Edgar, *Zenon Papyri*, IV, no. 59532. The four volumes of this group published by Edgar appeared in the *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du musée du Caire*, Vol. XV, Parts I-IV (Cairo, 1925-31). They are customarily referred to by the abbreviation P. C. Z.

<sup>3</sup> Selected letters of the group were published with running commentary by the late John Spencer Bassett in his *Southern Plantation Overseer as revealed in his Letters* (Northampton, 1925).

<sup>4</sup> Edgar, in *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, XIV (1928), 292.

The total number of documents preserved from Zenon's files runs to about 1,500 pieces, including the remaining numbers belonging to the Columbia University Library which have recently appeared<sup>5</sup> and a group in the British Museum, as yet unpublished. Those of the Polk Papers specifically dealing with the Yalabusha County plantation number 359.<sup>6</sup>

The soil of the two estates was virgin. The great plot managed by Zenon had but recently been uncovered from the bed of Lake Moeris. In the case of the Polk plantation a considerable amount of the land had to be cleared slowly before planting was possible.<sup>7</sup> In 1839 only 271 acres had been cleared. By 1842 the cleared land had risen to 374 acres. In 1851 it was 566 acres.<sup>8</sup> Respecting the size of the projects involved, the task of the young Greek was much more exacting than that which fell upon Ephraim Beanland, the first overseer of Polk's Yalabusha plantation, and later upon his successors. For the "grant land" managed by Zenon comprised about 6,250 acres, whereas Polk's land consisted of 880 acres at the time of purchase and was later increased to 960 acres.<sup>9</sup> Polk's farm was directly operated by Beanland, using only Negro slave labor. Zenon leased out large tracts of the irrigated land of which he was overseer. Where possible his leases were made with competent and responsible Greeks who had come to the ancient land of Egypt to exploit its fertile soil and its humble and industrious farming population. The Egyptian farmers whom they used were free men. These hired men were paid wages under the dual system of kind-and-coinage economy which prevailed in Egypt after Alexander the Great with his Macedonian army had conquered the country and Greek businessmen had moved in by thousands, exploiting a static economic system by the introduction of their modernized business methods and knowledge of organization. One of the certain results of the publication of the many Greek papyri from Egypt has been to prove the view, long since expressed by Ulrich Wilcken of Berlin,<sup>10</sup> that slavery never became the dominant form in the employment of labor in Egypt. Never at any time in the history of the country did it become so extensive, nor was it economically so important, as in Greek city-state handicraft production or in the latifundian slavery of the first two centuries before Christ in Italy and Sicily.

<sup>5</sup> William Linn Westermann, Clinton Walker Keyes, and Herbert Liebesny, eds., *Zenon Papyri*, Vol. II, Columbia Papyri, Greek Series, IV (New York, 1940).

<sup>6</sup> Bassett, p. 260.

<sup>7</sup> See the letter of the overseer, Beanland, *ibid.*, p. 62.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 194.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 275.

<sup>10</sup> Ulrich Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka* (Leipzig, 1899), I, 695 ff., 703 f.

When we compare the crops raised upon the two large farms, the superiority of the Greco-Egyptian culture, both in the sense of general culture and that of land cultivation, becomes apparent. The staple crops upon the Polk plantation were cotton and rice.<sup>11</sup> In addition the slave owners tried to raise enough corn, potatoes, and other vegetables to feed the slaves and enough hay and oats to feed the stock. They raised hogs to supply pork and bacon on the plantation, but they did not raise enough. A list of necessities, for example, to be purchased for the plantation, which was sent to Mrs. Polk by the overseer John Mairs, included a purchase of 1,200 pounds of bacon or pickled pork.<sup>12</sup> Apparently no sheep were raised on the Polk estate.

In contrast, the crops raised upon the "10,000 aroura grant land" of Apollonius were much more diversified. This estate grew wheat, barley, hay, and many varieties of vegetables, including the legumes required for the advanced system of crop rotation through which the fertility of the soil was maintained. For the requirements of the state monopoly of vegetable oil production Zenon had to see to it that a definite number of olive trees were planted, that the compulsory amount of sesame, croton, and castor bean plants demanded by the government oil monopoly was set out. Wine grapes were grown in large quantities. At the instance of King Ptolemy II himself fruit trees of many kinds, exotics in Egypt, were planted upon a large scale. Seedlings raised upon another experimental farm were transferred to the Fayum property, as shown by the following letter:

Apollonius to Zenon greetings: Carry as many pear shoots and young plants as you can from Memphis, from my garden and from the palace grounds, and take sweet-apple trees from Hermophilus and plant them.

Good-bye. Year 30, Dius 13, Hathyr 3.

The letter was written probably from Alexandria because Zenon received it ten days later (Dius 23), as shown by the date of reception which he wrote upon the back of the letter near the address.<sup>13</sup> By the

<sup>11</sup> Bassett, p. 11.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 196.

<sup>13</sup> P.C.Z., II, no. 59156. The double dating is by the Macedonian calendar with the corresponding date in the Egyptian month—Hathyr. Through the Egyptian date this can be exactly transposed as December 27, 256 B.C. The equation of the dates demanded an exact knowledge of the relation of the two calendars such as was available to Apollonius at Alexandria. Zenon, on receiving a letter, customarily wrote a brief of its contents on the back for filing purposes, giving the date of reception. Since his boss employed the double date, he felt that he too should make a gesture at it, at least. But he could not be exact as between the moon calendar of Macedon and the solar calendar of Egypt. Therefore he equated the dates. In this case his docket reads: "Year 30, Dius 23, Hathyr 23. About shoots."

same post Zenon received another letter from Apollonius, which reads:

Apollonius to Zenon greetings. Plant fir-trees throughout the entire orchard and around the vineyard and the olive-groves; and see that you set out more plants if you can, but at least not less than 300. For the tree is remarkable in appearance and will be useful for the king.

Good-bye. Year 30, Dios 13, Hathyr 3.<sup>14</sup>

According to C. C. Edgar, who knew modern Egypt from long service in the country and had developed an amazing and intimate knowledge of this group of papyri from years of experience in editing them, the last sentence meant that the fir-tree was both ornamental and serviceable as timber, presumably for ship masts.

In consequence of the relative simplicity of the Polk plantation as far as production was concerned, the problems of organization and management which faced Ephraim Beanland, Isaac Dismukes, and John Mairs on the Polk estate were not involved as compared with the complexities of the work of Zenon, the man from Caunus. The activities of Polk's overseers were confined to raising the crops of cotton and corn, ginning the cotton, and seeing that it was transported to a near-by shipping point. When it once became freight-on-board, on its way to the factors, thence to the warehouses of the cotton buyers, their obligations ceased. Procedures of sale, including discussions of price, were matters that lay between the cotton factor and the planter,<sup>15</sup> whether he were absentee owner or living on the plantation. The planter received his pay from the factor in the form of a draft. With that the year's effort was over.

The comparison here instituted between Zenon's activities and those of any one of Polk's plantation overseers has obviously turned into a study of contrasts. A highly complex economic and agricultural system in Egypt, empirically developed by three thousand years of growth, is brought into contrast with a system that is "modern", chronologically speaking, but nevertheless the more primitive of the two in its organizational form. Upon Zenon there fell, for example, the general supervision of many activities connected with the growth and development of the newly founded town of Philadelphia,<sup>16</sup> although the actual building operations were carried out by a trained *architecton* (master builder). In the same way and indicative of the high degree of pyramided author-

<sup>14</sup> See above, n. 13.

<sup>15</sup> See in Bassett, pp. 221-59, the letters that passed between the New Orleans brokerage firm, on the one side, and Polk and Mrs. Polk, on the other.

<sup>16</sup> Edgar, *Zenon Papyri in the University of Michigan*. Michigan Papyri, I (Ann Arbor, 1931), 30.

ity in the organization of the Egyptian estate, the actual direction of agricultural operations devolved upon a specialist named **Heraclides**, whose title was that of "supervisor of agriculture of the land at Philadelphia".<sup>17</sup>

In contrast with Zenon's oversight of building operations, Ephraim Beanland, the first overseer on the Polk plantation, did not even have charge of the original construction of the overseer's house and the quarters for the Negroes.<sup>18</sup> Something of the variety of the calls upon Zenon's time and energies may be gleaned from a letter of the physician **Artemidorus**, which must subsequently be quoted again in connection with the journey to Syria of the Egyptian Princess **Berenice**. **Artemidorus** asks Zenon to

buy for me, so that I may have these on my return, three metretes of honey of the best quality and six hundred artabs of barley for the animals. Pay for these out of the accounts for sesame and croton. Also look after my house in Philadelphia so that I may find it roofed over against my return; and try to take a look at the draft animals, the pigs, the geese, and the rest of the stock there, and see how they are doing.<sup>19</sup>

If we move upward from the Zenon-Ephraim Beanland contrast to one between the general business activities of the two absentee planters—of **Apollonius**, the Business Manager (**Dioecetes**) of Egypt, and of **Polk**, the politician who later became President of the United States—the result, I think, is about the same. One must recall that Egypt, in the days of **Apollonius**, was unquestionably the richest country of the western world centered about the Mediterranean Sea. **Apollonius** was not the sovereign with absolute powers—the ruler in whom the god manifested himself; but he was for about seventeen consecutive years the right hand of this deified ruler, representing him upon important occasions. In 252 B.C. King **Ptolemy** escorted his daughter, the Princess **Berenice**, from the palace at Alexandria as far as Pelusium in Egypt upon her journey to Syria to marry King **Antiochus II** of Syria. **Apollonius** accompanied the royal escort to Pelusium and himself was in full charge for the rest of the way to the northern borders of the Egyptian Empire in Syria.<sup>20</sup> This was the journey which seven years

<sup>17</sup> P.C.Z., IV, no. 59562, l. 23. *Ibid.*, II, no. 59292, l. 420, he is called "farmer of the 10,000 *arourae*".

<sup>18</sup> Bassett, p. 49.

<sup>19</sup> P.C.Z., II, no. 59521, ll. 4-8.

<sup>20</sup> The information comes from a letter which **Artemidorus**, personal physician of **Apollonius**, wrote to Zenon in the middle of April, 252 B.C. He states that he and **Apollonius** were then returning to Sidon in Phoenicia from the northern Syrian border: "We have been accompanying the princess as far as the borders." P.C.Z., II, no. 59251, ll. 1-3.

later was destined to terminate so tragically for the young princess.<sup>21</sup>

The public activity of James K. Polk, as representative in the legislature of Tennessee, member of Congress, and President of the United States, is well known. In his private affairs he was an industrious and active lawyer and a plantation owner. On the side of private affairs the life and obligations of Apollonius were much more complicated and varied. Aside from the greater variety of the crops raised upon his "grant land" and the aspect of his Fayum estate as a sort of experimental farm for the king, Apollonius controlled a weaving establishment in Memphis. He was in the transportation business also, both by land and by water. His fleet of freight boats for the Nile traffic was evidently extensive. A large fragment of a papyrus, published a few years ago, has shown that he organized and ran, through his agents, caravans of camels operating within lower Palestine and into Syria and between these external possessions and Egypt itself.<sup>22</sup> In establishing this business of freightage by camel he was bringing the Greek exploiters resident in Egypt into competition with the Arab sheiks in an individualized field of transportation which had long been their monopoly.

It is when one comes to the question of *savoir faire*, experience of the world, education, efficiency, and cultural interests, as opposed to native intelligence, that the comparison between a Zenon and a plantation overseer of the deep South becomes a complete contrast in colors. At least this holds good for Polk's overseers, who were probably quite as intelligent as the general run of plantation overseers of the South, possibly above the average. Their duties and the scope of their mental occupations were confined to the plantation—it crops, its stock, and its Negroes. The following quotation from a letter of Ephraim Bealand, written in the fall of 1834, is not untypical of his correspondence or of that of any one of his successors.

On last nite I got home from the Arkensis and I hearde of Jack but never cold get site of him and its seposed that he is in Shauney village which I was advised to not go theire for they is a den of thieves and to tell you the fact I donte think you will ever git him.<sup>23</sup>

In spelling, grammar, and clarity of expression this is the type of letter which a native Egyptian farmhand, if he were literate at all,

<sup>21</sup> The story of Berenice contains the dramatic elements of a Hollywood play. For the bare script see Edwyn Bevan, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty* (London, 1927), pp. 70-71, 189-92.

<sup>22</sup> Westermann and Elizabeth Sayre Hasenoechl, eds., *Zenon Papyri*. Vol. I, Columbia Papyri, Greek Series, III (New York, 1934), no. 2.

<sup>23</sup> Bassett, p. 79.

might write in Greek to Zenon. But Zenon himself—no! We have a draft containing erasures and improvements in expression—not corrections—of several letters that he wrote in autograph on this same problem of fugitive slaves. I quote from one of these:

To Pisistratus: If you are well it would be pleasing news. I, too, am well. Crotus has announced to me that Pasicles has written that the boys whom I bought in Marisa<sup>24</sup> from the slaves of Zaedelus are being held for a reward.<sup>25</sup> Therefore I have written asking that he take every precaution that they be seized and that he give them over to Straton, the bearer of these letters. So will you please remind him and earnestly assist him in order that they may not make good their escape.

When Zenon went with Apollonius upon tours of inspection of the crops and the other resources of Egypt, the party traveled as the Sahibs of India might travel in the heyday of British control. The retinue of the Dioecetes, Apollonius, spent its nights on a fleet of Nile boats which carried two stables of horses for their inland excursions, with a groom for each. A special cook went with them, and a bathmaster. They carried their own table linen and silver dishes, with a man in charge of each. Six scribes and accountants kept the records of the crop survey,<sup>26</sup> with stores of papyrus rolls to which they added dozens of rolls purchased en route as required.

Zenon himself had his literary interests and tastes, although until recently these could only be deduced from his businesslike records and correspondence dealing with official or estate affairs; they could not be proved by explicit statement of his reading habits.<sup>27</sup> Certainty in this regard has, however, recently been attained by the publication from the Columbia University group of papyri of a very fragmentary memorandum of Zenon which mentions two books, from his library, presumably. One was a "Collection of the Pro—" (the rest of the word is lost) written by Callisthenes.<sup>28</sup> This Callisthenes was a nephew and a scientific collaborator of Aristotle. He was the man who in 334 B.C. accompanied Alexander the Great on his expedition into Asia as campaign publicist and was put to death in the seventh year of the campaign on a charge of conspiracy against the young king. The second

<sup>24</sup> This is P.C.Z., I, no. 59015 verso. Marisa was a town in Idumaea of Palestine.

<sup>25</sup> The reward asked for their return was 100 drachmas.

<sup>26</sup> Westermann and Casper J. Kraemer, eds., *Greek Papyri in the Library of Cornell University* (New York, 1926), no. 1.

<sup>27</sup> This had been noted by Edgar in the introduction to *Zenon Papyri in the University of Michigan*, p. 49.

<sup>28</sup> Westermann, Keyes, and Liebesny, no. 60. The broken word beginning with "Pro—" was probably the Greek word for "Proxeny Treaties".



book was also a "collection", which dealt with embassies. Possibly it contained famous speeches made by Greek ambassadors. Whatever doubts the fragment may leave as to the titles of the books, it is certain that Zenon had in his personal library books of serious content, including typical collections of data such as the members of the Peripatetic School were prone to put together. It is also clear that he was encouraging his younger brother to make use of them. It is hard to imagine Beanland, Dismukes, or Mairs, the successive overseers of the Polk plantation, having any books other than the Bible. And if each had had his own small library, these would certainly not have included Jared Sparks's *The Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution* or his *Writings of George Washington*.

W. L. WESTERMANN.

*Columbia University.*

## DOCUMENTS

### MAZZINI TO MARGARET FULLER, 1847-1849

MARGARET Fuller met Mazzini during her visit to London in the fall of 1846. The exact date of their meeting is uncertain. Mazzini's letters to Miss Fuller written during the early part of November, 1846, indicate a series of broken appointments. "I am obliged to avail myself of your permission to defer my calling on you till Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday or Thursday of next week at your own choice and convenience." A later note reveals that he again postponed his promised visit. "If you have no objection I will call upon you towards the end of this week (Friday or Saturday) in the evening."<sup>1</sup> There is no doubt, however, that they met on November 10, 1846, when Miss Fuller attended the annual celebration of the free school for Italian boys which had been founded by Mazzini in 1841 at 5 Hatton Garden (afterward removed to 5 Greville Street).<sup>2</sup>

After their meeting the American critic and conversationalist described Mazzini "as by far the most beauteous man" she had ever seen, while he praised her as "one of the rarest of women in her love and active sympathy with everything great, beautiful, and holy".<sup>3</sup> During her stay in London she entertained him and their mutual friends, the Carlyles, at her rooms on Warwick Street. In a colorful note penned to Emerson she described a rather distraught visit which they paid her: "he [Mazzini] is a dear friend of Mrs. C.; but his being there gave the conversation a turn to 'progress' and ideal subjects, and C. was fluent in invectives on all our 'rose-water imbecilities'. We all felt distant

<sup>1</sup> The Fuller Papers, Widener Library, Harvard University, XI, 79, 80. The editor wishes to acknowledge her indebtedness to Mrs. Arthur B. Nichols of Cambridge for her kind permission to print this material and to Professor Gaetano Salvemini for many helpful suggestions.

<sup>2</sup> A reviewer commented upon Miss Fuller's appearance at the celebration. "Margaret was requested to address the children, which she did in English, speaking of the schools in her own country. It was not a very pleasant exhibition, her defects of intonation being exaggerated by a sense of the peculiarity of her position." *Southern Literary Magazine*, IX (1854), 129-40.

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs of Margaret Fuller Ossoli* (Boston, 1852), II, 173. Mazzini to Enrico Mayer, London, Dec. 24, 1846, in *Epistolario di Giuseppe Mazzini*, XVI (Imola, 1919), 321.

from him, and Mazzini, after some vain efforts to remonstrate, became very sad."<sup>4</sup>

The friendship between Mazzini and Margaret Fuller continued after her departure from England. In letters written by him to Giuseppe Lamberti he inquired after her welfare.<sup>5</sup> In January, 1847, he asked her to write a sketch of her European impressions for the *People's Journal*, the radical monthly established by John Saunders.<sup>6</sup> Upon another occasion he referred to the joy her letters brought him and added: "The spiritual contact with a small number of noble and purely elevated souls, who struggle here and there against the materialism and egoism of the century, is henceforth the only thing which gives strength of faith to a soul far more wearied by deceptions [and] far more aged than you can believe."<sup>7</sup>

After a brief sojourn in France Miss Fuller arrived in Italy during the spring of 1847. She and Mazzini met later on, shortly before the establishment of his Roman triumvirate. In a letter of March 9, 1849, to Marcus Spring she wrote:

Last night, I heard a ring; then somebody speak my name; the voice struck upon me at once. He [Mazzini] looks more divine than ever, after all his new, strange sufferings. . . . He stayed two hours, and we talked, though rapidly, of everything. He hopes to come often, but the crisis is tremendous, and all will come on him; since, if anyone can save Italy from her foes, inward and outward, it will be he.<sup>8</sup>

Within two months the French had begun their siege of Rome, and on July 3, 1849, their troops entered the city. Unwilling to capitulate, Mazzini to the very end wandered dismally through the deserted streets. Finally, he sought seclusion in the home of his friends, the Modenas, where Miss Fuller found him after he "had passed all these nights without sleep . . . grown old; all the vital juices . . . exhausted; his eyes . . . blood-shot; his skin orange . . . his hair . . . mixed with white; his hand . . . painful to the touch". To her he "had never flinched, never quailed; had protested in the last hour against surrender; sweet and calm, but full of a more fiery purpose than ever; in him", she wrote, "I revered the hero and owned myself not of that mould".<sup>9</sup> This in all probability was the last meeting between them. Mazzini was to return once again to London, an exile. Miss Fuller, bound for America, was to lose her life in the shipwreck of the bark

<sup>4</sup> *Memoirs*, II, 187.

<sup>5</sup> Nov. 24 and Dec. 16, 1846, in *Epistolario*, XVI, 285, 311.

<sup>6</sup> London, Jan. 17, 1847, Fuller Papers, XI, 89.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 91.      <sup>8</sup> *Memoirs*, II, 262.      <sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 268.

*Elizabeth* off the coast of Fire Island on the night of July 19, 1850.

In a letter describing the papers which survived her sister's death Mrs. William Ellery Channing stated: "There is nothing else in the trunk but Mazzini's letters, [letters] from other people to her and bills and accounts."<sup>10</sup> Part of these documents are undoubtedly the six letters printed below. With the exception of the first, written by Mazzini from London after his return from Paris in December, 1847, the remaining five were sent by him while he was at Rome in June and July, 1849, to Miss Fuller at the Casa Diez, Via Gregoriana.

LEONA ROSTENBERG.

*New York City.*

I

*My dear friend*<sup>11</sup>

I was when your letter came, wandering on the continent watching the progress of the Swiss affairs and the threatened interference which if it had not taken place, would have summoned me there—visiting my old Italian friends in Paris and gathering strength from personal intercourse with Mad. Sand whom I saw at Nohant, Lammenais, and a few, very few others.<sup>12</sup> I have been two months out of England and I felt, occasionally, as if I could not resist the wish of revisiting Italy; but the time had not yet come. A visit to my poor mother could not be ventured upon without making her frantic with terror and as for the rest I could not bear to be sent back to exile a short time after. If once I do reenter my country, I will die there. So once the Swiss affairs settled and when the French government began to be informed of my sojourn in forbidden France, I took myself back to London and the[re] like a true good smiling friend I found your letter. I do not know where you were perhaps Switzerland but I have— [corner of MS. missing] would have seen you and told me they had. I had received a few months ago a very dear souvenir from Mrs. Spring through an English friend but no information about you that you still lingered in my country.<sup>13</sup> I have still to thank you in words, for in heart, I have long ago—for your visit to my mother and for your letters.<sup>14</sup> I once wrote a long letter in answer and gave it to a young English officer who told me he was going to Rome but who did not go, kept my letters and died two months ago. I will not thank you for your lines and postscript in the *People's Journal* but I feel

<sup>10</sup> To Richard F. Fuller, 1850. Fuller Papers, XIV, 28.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, XI, 97.

<sup>12</sup> According to Mazzini's letters he was at Boulogne on October 13, at Paris on October 17, and returned to London on December 3, 1847. See *Epistolario*, XVIII (Imola, 1921), 7-133. At the time the Swiss Catholic cantons, formed into a league, the Sonderbund, were attempting to dissolve the Swiss Confederacy.

<sup>13</sup> Marcus and Rebecca Spring were Margaret Fuller's traveling companions. Mazzini speaks of them in flattering terms, stating that they were "interested in the cause of poverty and emancipation". Mazzini to Lamberti, London, Nov. 10, 1846, and Mazzini to Enrico Mayer, Dec. 24, 1846, *Epistolario*, XVI, 268, 321.

<sup>14</sup> Mazzini to his mother, London, Mar. 30, 1847: "She told me a thousand things regarding you in an ecstasy of admiration and sympathy." *Epistolario*, XVII (Imola, 1921), mmcxlvii.

deeply grateful to the feeling which dictated all that you have written.<sup>15</sup> As for the "Times" they have abused during the last two or three months Italy, Switzerland and what not. They grow visibly raging at the spirit of Democracy conquering every day now its way through their rotten aristocratic society.

You ought ere to this to have received a letter to the Pope which I wrote in a moment of wild enthusiasm one evening of [piece of MS. missing] was given over to him [piece of MS. missing] and month which has been now printed by some countrymen of mine, partly because of all great hopes of the Pope have failed, partly because some men belonging to the moderate party were uttering strange things about the language I had according to them used.<sup>16</sup> Tell me if you have received it. It has been implicitly answered in the speech to the Consulta and depend upon it your appeal would be utterly lost. Pius IX is evidently a good *man*: a charitable Christian, a zealous administrator of the *material* interest of his two millions of subjects; un buon curato: that is all. As a king he has neither genius nor energy. He fears the Jesuits and fears us. As a Pope he has been sent to *give the last blow to the papacy*; and it will be seen when he dies, "Old bottles will not contain new wine." He is the Louis XVI of the papal Rome. Never mind what people say to you about me or mine: they do not themselves know at what they are just now working. Like that adept of the magician in Goethe's [Faust?] providentially raised up a spirit, they will be at a loss how to subdue it. There is no need of telling them this: it is not prudent now to do so. But let a few months pass: things will speak for me. There is an immense mistake in all that is going on now in Italy "la prétention de créer une nation par le Machiavelisme" but it will soon be conquered. Our people want truth, and they shall know it. All that you see is the mere ebullition preceeding [*sic*] the true creative crisis. Our two great enemies will save us finally: I mean Papacy and Austria, the first by obliging us to face, soon or late, the religious question; the second, bound to compel us soon or late to merge all petty local improvement questions into the great national one. Rely on them and upon God whenever you are thinking of the fate of my country. The best man I can introduce to you now is Scipione.<sup>17</sup> He was a few weeks ago, out of Rome, but he must be in town by this [time?]. I have to write to him within a few [days and will] give him your address and he will call. [I will write a] few lines that you will give him when you see him.

The People's Journal has been very much mismanaged by the Editor Saunders: besides the squabble between him and Howitt—with whom (parenthèse) I have not had nor can have anything to do—has involved him

<sup>15</sup> Margaret Fuller submitted a poem entitled "To a Daughter of Italy" to the *People's Journal* for the issue of October 9, 1847. In a postscript to this contribution she wrote: "Mazzini is one of the men of ideas, born to give impulse to a coming age."

<sup>16</sup> Mazzini's letter to the pope, written at London on September 8, 1847, was privately printed and duly flung into the papal carriage by a confederate hand. In this work Mazzini declared that it was possible for Pius IX to unite Italy under a government unique in Europe—a democracy based on spiritual sanctions. He was to make his appeal directly to the Italians. "Do not seek alliances with princes. Achieve alliance with our people. The unity of Italy is of God. It will be achieved without you if not with you." See *Scritti politici, editi ed inediti, di Giuseppe Mazzini*, XII (Imola, 1922), 225-33.

<sup>17</sup> Scipione Pistrucci was a devoted friend of Mazzini. He had been exiled from France in 1833 and had escaped to England. He taught at the Greville Street school.

in an intricacy of debt and liability fatal to his paper.<sup>18</sup> It is truly a pity. The circulation is still very good, some 15 or 20,000 copies, I believe, but unless some change in the management does not take place it will fall. I had entertained a scheme for conquering it to the International League and to our own ideas;<sup>19</sup> perhaps it would not be impossible to find money for that, but on one side Saunders does not want to give it up and on the other, with all the uncertainty of my life and likely to be summoned one of these days to enter the struggle, which I believe soon or late to be unavoidable against Austria. I do not feel much entitled to embark in an enterprise which would mainly rest upon a faith that the sharers chose to put in me. However, if any such change should ever take place you will know of it immediately and I hope you will be *my* contributor. For the present I think you had better to wait a little longer before embarking in any series of articles.

Emerson is out of town lecturing but he is soon coming back to London.<sup>20</sup> I will see him I suppose and tell you of my impressions. I [piece of MS. missing] very much of course, but feel fearful that he leads or will lead man too much to contemplation. His work, I think very greatly needed in America, but in our own old world we stand in need of one who will like Peter the Hermit inflame us to the Holy Crusade and *appeal* to the collective influences and inspiring sources, more than to individual self-improvement. Will you tell me the address of Mrs. Spring? I wish to write a few words of thanks to her.

Could you prevail upon the American firm through which I write to receive now and then not frequently some letters addressed to the friend who will call on you even after you left Rome? You would render me a great service. But it is only in the case of some intercourse more intimate than that of a banker with a purpose of receiving money that I venture to ask this. Do not trouble yourself about it if you are merely slightly acquainted with them. Adieu my friend, I will write again, but there is a silence of the soul and though long silent, I have often been thinking of you and of your friendship as of a strengthening blessing on

Your devoted friend

Joseph

I write an address for me  
Sig. Michelangelo Rosselli  
23 Mincing Lane  
Dec. '47

## II

*Dear friend*<sup>21</sup>

Will you be woman and forgive? I will deserve to be forgiven, could you spend a whole day near me you would wonder not at my being silent with those I love, but at my living. From seven o'clock in the evening I have been continuously writing, writing even whilst I speak with people, writing *à la vapeur*. At seven o'clock I was called to the bedside of a friend, Mameli a

<sup>18</sup> John Saunders (1810-95) wrote eighteen novels and numerous short stories.

<sup>19</sup> "The People's International League" was founded by Mazzini on April 28, 1847, under the presidency of Dr. John Bowring. It was to be regarded as a rallying point for democracy and nationalism.

<sup>20</sup> Emerson was in England at this time on a lecture tour.

<sup>21</sup> Fuller Papers, XI, 163.

young soldier and poet of promise, whom I had to decide to hear the amputation of the leg and whom I found so ill that even that could not be done;<sup>22</sup> I left him at nine o'clock went for the first time to eat something, came back to the palace, then to begin again till one o'clock. After midnight everything from the detail of a soldier arrested at St. Angelo to the defence, from a quarrel between two officers to a dissenting between two generals came down to me. I scarcely even write a few words to my mother. Should the thing last long there is no human strength or will that can resist it. Keep this note for you; it *is* for you only. I do not like the other people to know that I am working more than another man.

I have been often thinking of you; the only thing I could do. Keep faithful and trustful; pray for Rome and Italy: it is centered here.

Ever yours

June 9

Jos. Mazzini

### III

*Dear friend*<sup>23</sup>

It is written that none will trust my heart, you too! Can you believe for a single moment such nonsense as that of St. Peter's being mined, whilst I am here. Have I proved a Vandal or a man of 93? Is there a Frenchman who has been molested and whilst our best patrols and my best friends, Danielo and others,<sup>24</sup> are dying under the musketry of those wretches outside the walls, am I not offering protection to this palace to the only representative of France here? My soul is full of grief and bitterness, and still, I have never for a moment yielded to reactionary feelings. Let people talk about St. Peter's: it may be of some use but depend upon a friendly word: no one will see them, I repeat whilst I am here. Write everytime you like to do so. Do not punish me for not being able to write to my friends.

Ever yours

June 24, 1849

Jos. Mazzini

### IV

I send the permit to enter the gardens. My having forgotten it these two days will show you dear friend, how my poor head is. On your showing the other pass to the Direzione di Pubblica Sicurezza you will have the pass for the gates. As for the rest I don't know whether I am witnessing the agony of a Great Town or a successful resistance. But one thing I know, that resist we must, that we *shall* resist to the last, and that my name will never be appended to capitulation.

Yours in haste

June 28, 1849<sup>25</sup>

Jos. Mazzini

<sup>22</sup> Goffredo Mameli, the soldier-poet, was mortally wounded on June 3 at the Corsini. He died within a few days after the writing of this letter.

<sup>23</sup> Fuller Papers, XI, 105.

<sup>24</sup> Research has failed to reveal the identity of Danielo. He is not mentioned in Giuseppe Spada, *Storia della rivoluzione di Roma* (Florence, 1868-70, Vol. III, chap. xviii), among those who fell around June 30, nor is he cited among the Garibaldi legionnaires in Ermanno Loevinson, *Giuseppe Garibaldi e la sua legione nello stato romano, 1848-49* (3 vols., Rome, 1902-1907).

<sup>25</sup> Fuller Papers, XI, 112.



E concesso alla Sig. Margaret Fuller di circolare liberamente nei giardini del Quirinale e di conduri con se qualche convalescenti.

Roma 28 Guigno 49<sup>26</sup>

## V

*Dear friend*<sup>27</sup>

It is all over, I have struggled to the last against the weakness of the Assembly: and at last proposed that Assembly, Government, Army and all should walk out of Rome and prolong the existence elsewhere and I will send you a copy of my protestation. But it is all over for the present moment. I don't know what I shall do, I cannot think of it. Meanwhile let me work for others, Angelo Brunetti Ciceruacchio and his son Lorenzo twelve years old,<sup>28</sup> but having fought bravely out of the walls and afraid of the priests and I their agent I have to get, if possible, a passport for them and I ask you to do that. I could write to Mr. Cass but I prefer to avail myself of *your* help.<sup>29</sup> You must have friends among the influential Americans. Could they get the passports with different names, of course, or better to be filled with Italian names but of subjects of the United States so as to have protection assured? They would do a good action. Could they add a third, it might perhaps be of some use to me hereafter.

Ever yours,

Joseph Mazzini

Address to Gustavo Modena<sup>30</sup>

60 Piazza di Picena

July 3

## VI

I have made my mind up, dear friend, and I shall go, that is endeavor to go—I must go to Switzerland. How to reach it that is the problem. By land, I have to cross Tuscany, Piedmont etc. and the Austrians are there and the Piedmontese Government not unlike the Austrian. By sea I have Civita Vecchia, a town en état de siege, and where they can if they choose, arrest me, then Marseilles worse than any other place: I am known there. Once beyond Marseilles and travelling cautiously, I have nothing to fear. Do you know of any American or English family travelling toward Switzerland or going to travel? Joining them under a little disguise and with my American passport the thing would be made easier.<sup>31</sup> Of course if there were any

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 111.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>28</sup> Angelo Brunetti Ciceruacchio had been an admirer of Pius IX. Later he became one of the most stalwart defenders of the Roman Republic. After the capture of Rome by General Oudinot he and his two sons, one of them, Lorenzo (referred to above), a boy of sixteen years, were shot at the order of the French general.

<sup>29</sup> Lewis Cass, jr., the American attaché at Rome.

<sup>30</sup> Mazzini sought refuge at Modena's home after the entry of the French into Rome. See Margaret Fuller's letter to William H. Channing, Rome, July 8, 1849, *Memoirs*, II, 267.

<sup>31</sup> According to a letter written by Mazzini to Emilie Ashurst, Genoa, on September 27, 1856, Margaret Fuller had procured a passport for him. "I had a passport from him (Mr. Case) [Mazzini is referring to Lewis Cass, jr.] through poor Miss Fuller's unexpected exertions, I believe. I had it already when I was at Civita Vecchia, that is after having been seven or eight days in Rome putting all my friends to despair and walking leisurely through the streets when everybody had left." *Epistolario*, XXXIII (Inola, 1931), 116.

chance of finding out one, I could patiently await and keep myself concealed till the day of their departure. There is not, most likely, any possibility of such a thing still as the thought comes across me there is no inconvenience in shaping it forth. You will answer a word and believe me dear friend

Ever yours

[No date]<sup>32</sup>

Joseph

<sup>32</sup> Fuller Papers, XI, 110.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### GENERAL HISTORY

*The Prehistoric Foundations of Europe to the Mycenaean Age.* By C. F. C. HAWKES, Assistant Keeper of British Antiquities, British Museum. (London: Methuen and Company. 1940. Pp. xv, 414. 21s.)

THIS book can be recommended without reservation not only to those who have a special interest in European prehistory but also to the much wider audience of anthropologists and archaeologists who wish to keep abreast of the main developments in areas outside those of their own specialization. It will be less useful to the formal historian since the upper limit of the period covered, the end of the Mycenaean Age, falls short of the beginnings of western European history by several centuries. Outside of the Aegean area it is difficult to understand the relations of the last of the cultures described here with even the earliest known from written records. In view of the information available on the Late Bronze and Iron Ages of western Europe it seems unfortunate that the author set the same time limit for his descriptions of all parts of the continent.

This stricture does not diminish the value of the book for American archaeologists. Most of these recognize that there have been important developments in European prehistory during the last few years, but they are rarely able to follow these as they appear in numerous journals and in a wide variety of languages. Among the wealth of recent findings here presented certain items appear of especial interest. Thus it seems to be established that, even at the beginning of the Pleistocene, there were two widely divergent types of culture present in Europe. That these were associated with different Hominoid species, as the author concludes, seems considerably less certain. Eastern Europe now emerges as of great importance to the development of European culture from at least the Upper Paleolithic on. A whole series of cultures unfamiliar to the average American are described, and the role of the region in the transmission of Asiatic culture is made clear. Of interest also are the high development and long duration of the hunting cultures of northern Europe. Evolving independently from the Mesolithic, these cultures were sufficiently rich and vigorous to influence many of the Neolithic cultures of southeastern European origin.

The present book not only brings together the piecemeal literature on European prehistory but also organizes this exceedingly complex material and presents it in compact form. All the descriptions of cultures are supplemented by references to the original sources. Type objects are illustrated, and there is a series of chronological tables and distribution maps which

are invaluable for clarifying the interrelations of the cultures discussed. The value of these charts is increased by their extension to include culture sequences from Troy and Egypt, which serve as a basis for exact dating.

*Columbia University.*

RALPH LINTON.

*Camden Miscellany*. Volume XVII. [Camden Third Series, Volume LXIV.] (London: Royal Historical Society. 1940. Pp. xx, 74, x, 29, xiv, 56.)

ABOUT half of this volume is taken up with documents relating to the cathedral priory of Ely. The abbey of Ely, a Benedictine house founded in 970 after the destruction of an earlier abbey by the Danes, became a cathedral priory in 1109, when the bishopric of Ely was established. This priory was in the middle rank of English houses with respect to wealth. Though its ordinances repeatedly enjoined recruitment up to the full quota of seventy, the number of monks remained about fifty. Shortly before the dissolution it fell to twenty-four. There lived on the premises of the priory, also, in its best days, a family of about one hundred servants, workmen, and clerks.

Of the nine documents here printed the earliest is dated 1241 and the last, 1515. All contain legislation for the priory. For the most part they are injunctions of the bishop of Ely or of the archbishop, following upon a visitation. Documents of this sort are relatively plentiful; these constitute a modest addition. No startling incompetence is revealed, no great scandal exposed. Two of the nine documents are ordinances not of the bishop or archbishop but of the chapter. These abound in frank criticism of the prior. Among other things he was rebuked for his arbitrary and irresponsible conduct of the business affairs of the priory and for his burdensome household. The chapter ordinances stipulated that the prior's complement of twenty-one servants should be considerably reduced. During a visitation by Archbishop Thomas Arundel, in 1401, the prior resigned as a result of the disclosure of certain indiscretions and irregularities. The editor, Seiriol J. A. Evans, has written a helpful introduction.

Included in the volume is a brief account of a journey of Henry Cavendish to Constantinople and return, in 1589. Cavendish was a well-connected English gentleman and a typical Elizabethan, "fiery, turbulent, and adventurous" (p. iv). He began his journey on March 28 with three servants and a friend. Taking ship to Hamburg and proceeding overland through Germany and the Balkans, Cavendish and his party reached Constantinople on June 16. The account here printed is not the work of Cavendish but of his servant Fox, whose outlook was that of a rustic of limited education, always sure that English ways were best. His narrative is without special distinction whether of manner or of matter. Such accounts are, however, rare in this period.

The last item in this volume is a series of four documents relating to the six-year tenure by Sir John Eliot of the post of vice-admiral of Devon. Eliot's principal was, of course, the duke of Buckingham. During the duke's ab-

sence from England Eliot's enemies secured his suspension from office by the council on charges of corruption. The documents here printed reveal that Eliot had indeed followed the usual custom of assessing the property which passed through his hands at one figure and selling it at another. The conclusion of the editor, Professor Harold Hulme, is that Eliot was "probably more honest than most vice-admirals of his day" (p. xiii). It may have been for that reason, in part, that the case against him was dropped, another reason being, perhaps, that more important matters were at hand.

*Boston University.*

WARREN O. AULT.

*Norwegische Wirtschaftsgeschichte.* Von OSCAR ALBERT JOHNSEN, Professor an der Universität Oslo. (Jena: Verlag von Gustav Fischer. 1939. Pp. viii, 590. 28 M.)

THE author of this volume now has behind him a generation of prolific scholarship. It is therefore something of an event that he has prepared a comprehensive survey of Norway's economic history. The work is projected on a broad scale, and the literature that has been drawn upon is extensive; the bibliography alone runs to thirty closely packed pages.

Under the author's own name appear no less than twenty-eight titles, good evidence of his specialized work in the field. One topic among the titles is particularly relevant to the present volume, namely, Norwegian overseas trade from the days of the Hansa to the Napoleonic period. This interest has helped to determine the distribution of space. Only twelve pages are devoted to the pre-Viking period, for which, admittedly, sources are scarce, and barely a hundred pages to the post-Napoleonic century, for which the sources are overwhelming.

In this closing section the author is not at his best. His exposition breaks into obvious headings, such as trade, shipping, mining, communications, etc., and the treatment savors at times of the statistical handbook. One misses here the firmer synthesizing approach of the main portions of the book. This, in a work intended for foreign readers, seems unfortunate. American students, especially, will wish that Professor Johnsen had more consistently pointed up the factors which in the last generation and a half have helped to make "The New Norway". One catches little sense of the drama that brought arresting advances in social legislation, nor does one glimpse the dynamics behind the challenge after 1905 to foreign capital in the hydro-electric industries or the forces behind the modern Arctic imperialism, which less than a decade ago supported a sharp dispute over East Greenland. Some fourteen pages are devoted to the wars of the Napoleonic era and more to their after-effects, but there is no equivalent account of the first World War and the powerful dislocations which it forced upon the economy of Norway. The tariff history of the last century is carried well into the twenties, but there is no reference to the Oslo Convention. The immigration question is treated very briefly; the documentation, moreover, is inadequate since it

makes no mention of the exhaustive labors in this field of Professor Theodore C. Blegen and his associates in the Norwegian-American Historical Association.

But any shortcomings on the last century are more than compensated for in the treatment of the previous four or five centuries. Particularly rich and suggestive are the expositions of the Hansa's activities in Norway, the country's political and economic decline in the late medieval period, the later rise of a self-conscious middle class, the growth of absolutism, and the spread of mercantilist regulation. A glow of approval often hovers over the author's discourse when it bears on the rural population and the Norwegian *bonde* (the author has to his credit several studies in this field). It is perhaps not wholly an accident that the volume closes with some paragraphs on what the Norwegian farming population has been able to do through organized effort.

The reader will lay down the volume with a feeling of gratitude to Professor Johnsen. He has assembled the conclusions of a large body of specialized literature and made them available in a convenient form (there is an adequate index). His German style is uniformly clear and direct. Specialists will welcome this volume as a standard reference in the field, and anyone concerned with the economic history of western Europe will find in it points of interest.

New York University.

OSCAR J. FALNES.

*Glimpses of Mennonite History.* By JOHN C. WENGER. (Scottdale: Mennonite Publishing House. 1940. Pp. xii, 126. 75 cents.)

*For Conscience Sake: A Study of Mennonite Migrations resulting from the World War.* By SANFORD CALVIN YODER, Professor of Bible, Goshen College. [Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History.] (Goshen: Mennonite Historical Society. 1940. Pp. xix, 300. \$2.00.)

DR. Wenger attempts to tell the story of the rise and subsequent history of Mennonites in some sixty pages. His aim is to inspire "the youth of the Mennonite Church . . . to a higher level of Christian living". His ideal Mennonite seems to be rather closely tied to the soil, the Pennsylvania German dialect, and "plain clothing". The passing of these marks of the ideal Mennonite, together with some of their concomitants, presents for him "a mighty challenge". Referring to the contemporary Dutch Mennonites, he asserts that they "are a rich and powerful social group, making large contributions to Dutch culture, but they are liberal in theology and have little activity". He assumes that Protestantism existed before 1529 and maintains that "The Reformation was . . . purely religious in origin." These statements occur in chapters the bibliographies of which give not a single outstanding authority on the Reformation. A list of true and false statements (in an appendix) about Mennonites contains some that are not universally true or false for Mennonites. The book is too short, the bibliography too limited,

and the author not sufficiently objective to make this work useful for scholars. It may serve the purpose of indoctrinating youth.

*For Conscience Sake* is a dissertation on the migrations of Mennonites since 1914. If history "is a record of man's migrations", Mennonites have been making history in this period. Some Canadian Mennonites who, after the first World War, were denied the privilege of conducting their own schools in the German language migrated to Mexico and Paraguay. When the Russian Mennonites clashed with the new order in Russia, some of them left for Germany, Canada, Paraguay, Brazil, Mexico, and other regions. A few Polish Mennonites migrated to Canada and Paraguay. According to one estimate over fifty thousand Mennonites moved to new homes. Dr. Yoder gives a sympathetic interpretation of the documents, a number of which he includes in his appendixes. He also discusses the problems of the Mennonites in the United States and Canada resulting from conscription during the World War. His point of view is much broader than that of Dr. Wenger. In his bibliography he has omitted several works referred to in footnotes. In the chapters on the coming of the Mennonites and Anabaptists to America, in the colonial period, neither of these authors mentions John Cooke, whose death in 1695 marked the passing of the "last surviving male Pilgrim of those who came over on the Mayflower". Apparently he was an Anabaptist preacher and by two lines an ancestor of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Dr. Yoder avoids the larger problem of refugees in general during this period. He also skirts the interesting problem of the relation between the refugee problem and the passing of the frontier, with its concomitant, the restriction of immigration. He does not fully discuss the problem of the insistence of some of the Mennonites in Canada and most of them in Russia on the German language and traditions. Apparently these Mennonites had not quite learned to obey the command to "make disciples of all the nations". On the other hand, it must be added that he does not approve the stand of those Mennonites who tied religion and conscience to language and nationality.

*Western Reserve University.*

JACOB C. MEYER.

*Charles Morton's "Compendium physicae".* [Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Volume XXXIII, Collections.] (Boston: the Society. 1940. Pp. xl, 237. \$5.00.)

THIS work, now published for the first time, affords a singularly vivid impression of seventeenth century science as presented to college students in England and America. Moreover, to add to the value of the volume there is an excellent biographical sketch of the author by Samuel E. Morison as well as a critical introduction and notes by Theodore Hornberger and an adequate index.

The circumstances surrounding Morton's life make his work an au-



thentic picture of the intellectual status of science in his time. He was among the “rude and pragmatical persons” intruded upon Oxford during the Cromwellian revolt, a number of whom formed the “Invisible College”, the basis for the Royal Society. Upon being removed through the Restoration, Morton established a Dissenting academy, and it was here that he composed, about 1680, the *Compendium physicae*. In its comprehensiveness this survey resembles the *De subtilitate* of Cardan, but it is lighter and more frankly didactic in tone. It contains scores of rhymed mnemonic couplets, such as that setting forth the three chief astronomical systems:

Absurd and intricate the old is yet,  
Tichoes imperfect, the Other is compleat.

Morton, like other authors of his time, had not lost sight of the fact that reference to the historical background of science constitutes a valuable pedagogical aid.

Morton's academy was eminently successful, but it was so harassed by the civil authorities that in 1686 he accepted the call to a church in the New World. Here he was soon involved as an exorcist in the trials for witchcraft, the existence of which was to him no less real than the phenomena of heat, light, and motion. Political difficulties meanwhile had thwarted his appointment as president of Harvard, but as fellow and vice-president Morton exerted a considerable influence on the college. Moreover, his *Compendium physicae* was promptly adopted there and, copied and recopied, remained in use for some forty years before being superseded by the distinctly Newtonian *Experimental Course on Mechanical Philosophy* of Isaac Greenwood, first Hollis Professor.

The sixteenth century had witnessed the revolt against authority, but it remained for the seventeenth to establish the new scientific methodologies. The *Compendium physicae* betrays most ingenuously the confusion of thought which such a transition inevitably engendered. It is a potpourri of ancient and modern ideas—a microcosm of man's speculation about nature from the time of Pythagoras to the eve of Newton's *Principia*. Into a pattern which one recognizes as taken from Scholastic treatments of the Aristotelian *corpus* the author has sought to weave such brand-new contributions as those of Gilbert on “magnatism and elatery”, of Harvey on the circulation of the blood, and of Galileo and Wallis on the tides:

Phainominon of tides hath its Solution  
from Earths Swift, Slow, unequal revolution.

Morton displays familiarity with the work of Torricelli and Boyle, and yet he does not abandon the Peripatetic *horror vacui*. He gives up Aristotle's intelligences and crystal spheres for the vortices and aetherial matter of Descartes, but he retains the Empedoclean elements and a Theophrastic-Paracelsian theory of metals. Although he cites with approval Descartes's

explanation of refraction, he follows Aristotle on color and in regarding the rainbow as "nothing but a multiplied reflection of the Sun from a dewy Cloud". His physiology of the nervous system is derived from Borelli, and there is a trace of Cartesianism in his distinction between the memory of brutes and man's reminiscence; but with respect to the soul and the complexions of the body he accepts Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas. Such citations add to the evidence that in England in Morton's day science was perhaps more preponderately Cartesian than Baconian. Moreover, they effectively dispel any lingering notion that Newtonianism forthwith dominated scientific thought in Europe and the American colonies.

*Brooklyn College.*

CARL B. BOYER.

*The United States, Great Britain, and British North America, from the Revolution to the Establishment of Peace after the War of 1812.* By A. L. BURT, Professor of History, University of Minnesota. [The Relations of Canada and the United States, James T. Shotwell, Director.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1940. Pp. vii, 448. \$3.25.)

PROFESSOR Burt has written the most thorough and detailed summary which has yet appeared of the whole course of Canadian-American relations, and of Anglo-American relations so far as they affected these, from the beginning of the Revolution to the partial settlement of the boundary and fisheries questions in the Convention of 1818. He has not only covered the ground minutely; he has offered quite definite answers to a number of controversial questions and has made or suggested important revisions of generally accepted views on a number of points. A few of his conclusions may be briefly noted.

Shelburne's generosity to the American peace commissioners of 1782 in the matter of the northern boundary is explained as due (1) to British war weariness, (2) to Shelburne's desire to wean the United States from France, (3) to the small importance attached in London to the fur trade involved (pp. 33-35). Contrary to the belief generally accepted in the United States, the interests of the fur trade were not a factor of importance in the retention of the Western posts from 1783 to 1796. The fundamental reason for this retention, according to Professor Burt, was the tardy realization that in ceding the Northwest to the United States the British had betrayed their Indian allies and the desire to undo that betrayal in the interests of Indian peace and of British prestige among the red men. This interpretation will probably receive general acceptance, though the author rather overplays his hand in supporting it. It seems slightly naïve to argue that the British government would not have supported the fur trade by a policy of which the public costs exceeded the private profits. Governments have been persuaded to pursue such policies on more than one occasion. It is hardly fair, furthermore, to take as typical of the costs of maintaining the posts the expenditures at Detroit in the very active war year of 1779-1780 (pp. 82-85). Pro-

fessor Burt's exoneration of the British government of the charge of retaining the posts from an economic motive is qualified by his admission that before the posts were abandoned the British had come to value them in connection with a "vision of a commercial empire over the heart of the continent" (p. 104). Lord Dorchester, not Simcoe, is held responsible for the warlike and threatening British frontier policies of 1794 (pp. 133-38). In his account of the Jay-Grenville negotiations of 1794 Professor Burt takes sharp issue with Professor Bemis's theory that Hamilton's indiscreet revelations to Hammond deprived Jay of weapons with which he might have wrung better terms from Grenville (p. 155). Professor Burt argues that Jefferson made a serious mistake and took a long step on the road to war in rejecting the Monroe-Pinkney treaty of 1806 with Great Britain (p. 239).

Nearly two fifths of the volume is taken up with the controversies leading to the War of 1812, the war itself, and the peace negotiations at Ghent. The chapter on the Treaty of Ghent, while thoroughly satisfactory, raises few controversial questions and offers little that is new. The chapter on the war is well worth reading, even by persons familiar with the northern campaigns, for its vigorous and sound criticism of the fatuity of American strategy. Professor Burt's account of the prolonged controversies over impressments, blockades, and the Rule of 1756 is excellent in the main. It is difficult, however, to follow his argument (p. 222) that because Napoleon's seizures of American ships, with few exceptions, "were all made in port and therefore within the undoubted jurisdiction of his own or a subordinate government", he was not acting in violation of neutral rights. If a blockade was illegal, as Napoleon's undoubtedly was, was the illegality mitigated because seizures in enforcement of the blockade were made in port and not on the high seas?

The reviewer finds it necessary to dissent, in part at least, from Professor Burt's rejection of frontier grievances and ambitions as an essential factor in bringing on the war (pp. 305-10). That Western indignation at Great Britain was in part the result of British interference with the markets for Western products may well be granted. This thesis was suggested some ten years ago by Mr. G. R. Taylor, whose articles, incidentally, find no place in Professor Burt's footnotes. In this respect, however, the West had no unique grievance. It did have a unique grievance in its conception—even though it was partly a misconception—of British policy among the Indians. That some Westerners proposed to solve their Indian troubles by expelling the British from Canada Professor Burt admits. The question is how heavily this motive weighed in determining the close vote on the declaration of war. In the absence of scales of sufficient accuracy this weight must remain a matter of opinion, but it can easily be shown, I think, that Professor Burt underestimates it. He writes, for example: "The seat of the native strife lay off in a remote corner. Relatively few whites lived anywhere near it, and they had no representatives in Congress" (p. 309). A reading of the

Kentucky and Ohio press in the months following the battle of Tippecanoe gives quite a different impression. To the people (or at least to the editors) of those states the seat of native strife did not seem "in a remote corner", and these people were not without their influential voices in Congress. Again, in contending that the prospect of gaining Florida was not a factor in swaying Southern votes in favor of war, Professor Burt minimizes the demonstrable facts (1) that the South was keenly covetous of Florida, (2) that all but a small corner of the territory had as yet proved unattainable, (3) that war with England offered an excellent excuse for seizing all of it. Utterances of public men, in Congress and out, coupled Florida and Canada as twin objects of conquest. Why deny all motivating force to this prospect of profits from war? Professor Burt argues his case plausibly and temperately but does not quite convince.

But this defect, if defect it is, is a small one in what in nearly all respects is an admirable book. Particularly appealing is the consistent attempt to understand and explain rather than condemn the shortcomings exhibited on either side of the international boundary line.

*University of Buffalo.*

JULIUS W. PRATT.

*The Gold Rushes.* By W. P. MORRELL, Reader in History in the University of London. [The Pioneer Histories, edited by V. T. Harlow and J. A. Williamson.] (New York: Macmillan Company. 1941. Pp. xi, 426. \$3.00.)

THIS is an important volume on an important subject. It provides a valuable survey of the gold rushes in Brazil, Siberia, California, British Columbia and the Rocky Mountain states, Australia and New Zealand, South Africa, the Yukon Territory, and Alaska. Much inaccessible material is drawn upon and made available to the general and the special student. Maps illuminate the accounts, and a select bibliography on each region increases the value of the work. Throughout the author points to comparisons and contrasts between regions and within regions, to the importance of the migration of labor and skill, to the evolution of technique, and to the development of political control. Brazil and Siberia, particularly the latter, differ sharply in the rate and character of development from regions dominated by Anglo-Saxons and free enterprise. Victoria differed from California because of the backgrounds of the miners (p. 257).

In spite of the importance of the volume in providing a history of the gold rushes and in suggesting broad and significant generalizations, it is difficult to resist the temptation to ask for more or to indulge in metaphors peculiar to reviews of books on mining. Mr. Morrell has written a volume which has yielded the first rich returns of a gold rush, but a more persistent and systematic working of the deeper diggings would have brought even larger yields. One finds continually generalizations which should be pushed into broader perspective. In the suggestion that mining broke the cake of

puritanical custom in the United States one would like to see a description of the effects of Western development on journalism and literature in the Eastern states mention W. R. Hearst and Mark Twain. In the reference to the role of labor in the mining regions of the West how far was it responsible for the dominance of radical unionism in the Western states and in western Canada, as contrasted with craft unionism in the East? In the discussion of the relation of gold mining to protectionism in Victoria one would welcome a reference to the free trade point of view in New South Wales and the consequent difficulties of Australian federalism.

The most serious weakness becomes evident in a neglect of the geographical implications. The gold rushes were primarily of far-reaching significance in opening up the Pacific. A rearrangement of the chapters to show continuous development along the western fringe of North America from California to British Columbia, the Yukon, and Alaska and later discussion of Australasia and South Africa would have brought out more clearly the place of gold rushes in economic development since the middle of the nineteenth century. A clearer perspective would have suggested the direct effects of gold mining on other economic activities evident in a sudden increase in a large virile population and in the emergence of a wide range of economic activities. The results were evident in part in the construction of transcontinental railways in North America and in the marked expansion of the interior of the continent, notably in the production of wheat. The political structures of Australia, South Africa, Canada, and the United States and of the British Empire were profoundly influenced by the peculiar economic effects of the gold rushes on the Pacific regions. The Oriental problem arose in the gold producing regions, and regulations in one district had their effect on other districts. The gold rushes created unique disturbances to economic equilibrium directly and indirectly. Mr. Morrell might have given greater emphasis to the direct effects, but we can hardly ask for more than he has given in one volume.

*University of Toronto.*

H. A. INNIS.

*Not to me Only.* By CALEB FRANK GATES. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1940. Pp. x, 340. \$3.00.)

THIS autobiography by one of the rare characters among our educators, missionaries, and "diplomats" is a welcome addition to that long list of books which, for the most part, have been written to make us cosmopolitan minded. But the president emeritus of Robert College in his charming volume has something more, for he narrates the story of a long life, chronicles in detail our missionary and educational activities in the Ottoman Empire and in modern Turkey, and also weaves into his story many aspects of Ottoman and Turkish events that are decidedly in the domain of diplomacy. Thus the book is burdened with multiple purposes and is bound to produce in the reader variety of reactions.

The life of this missionary as related here answers clearly many questions as to why and how and with what zeal our missionaries have undertaken their tasks and to what extent they have succeeded in carrying out their "missions". The author's unselfish acts throughout the last two decades of the last century in Syrian and Armenian communities as educator, administrator, and guide to many thousands of innocent victims once and for all demonstrates that missionary activity is one of altruism, for it has been the least "profitable" of all enterprises. Though our author would be reluctant to admit it, yet we have been unsuccessful as missionaries. Our singular success has been in education and philanthropy, and for that the missionaries are entitled to their due share of praise. The introduction of Western education and Western ideas was not the monopoly of our missionary-educators, yet perhaps they have done as much in this respect as all other groups combined. For nearly half a century we had four colleges and a university (in Beirut) in the Ottoman Empire, the educational work of which it is difficult to exaggerate, especially among the racial minorities. Of these institutions Robert College of Constantinople was the most prominent, and Dr. Gates was its president for exactly thirty years, beginning in 1903.

The book is bound to elicit a mixture of praise and criticism for its outstanding quality—the strange blending of a Christian-missionary life with Turkish nationalist history. Throughout the reader cannot escape the feeling that even a missionary had to play politics, sometimes with a band of criminals in the Young Turk regime. Though the author is critical of Abdul Hamid, his praise of the Young Turks' successors reaches the point of blind adulation. Here his sympathy may have been with the innocent victims, but his outspoken praise goes to those who perpetrated the cruelest massacres in modern history. His estimate of Kemal Ataturk and his successor is of course flattering to the Turks but surely at variance with known facts. He confounds Armenian aspirations with the agitation of a handful of individuals and roundly condemns the Armenian national movement. Where others have failed in approbation, Dr. Gates certainly fails in appreciation. To this reviewer it is shocking to find in this otherwise admirable book what is almost a condonation of the massacres of 1915, which, incidentally and of course mistakenly, are attributed to imperial Germany.

*Library of Congress.*

A. O. SARKISSIAN.

*Reparation at the Paris Peace Conference from the Standpoint of the American Delegation.* By PHILIP MASON BURNETT. [The Paris Peace Conference, History and Documents, published for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of Economics and History.] Two volumes. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1940. Pp. xxiv, 1148; 833. \$15.00.)

*A Journal of Reparations.* By CHARLES G. DAWES, Chairman, First Committee of Experts, Reparation Commission. Forewords by Lord Stamp,

H. Brüning. Appendix I, Suggestion of Expert Inquiry, by Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State. Appendix II, Various Letters and Telegrams relative to the Work of the Expert Committees. Appendix III, Official Report of Expert Committees as submitted to the Reparation Commission. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1939. Pp. xxxv, 527. \$5.00.)

HERE are two extremely valuable contributions to an extensive and varied literature on a subject which, only a few years ago, loomed large in economic and political discussion. Reparations of the variety bequeathed to us by the first World War as one of its worst legacies are today a dead issue. And yet who knows whether or not a new reparation problem may not be with us when the present war has come to an end?

Mr. Burnett's work, in spite of its great length, covers only the first chapter of the reparation story—the discussion at the Peace Conference in Paris. Written from the standpoint of the American delegation and with materials drawn mainly from American sources, the book presents necessarily a somewhat one-sided picture. It is a more attractive picture—if one is justified in using that adjective in connection with the unsavory combination of political stupidity and economic cupidity which was the reparation business—than would have been the case had French, British, and other Allied sources been equally available and equally fully utilized. For, after all, the American participants in the reparation discussion in Paris were considerably more objective and reasonable than most of their European colleagues.

As everyone familiar with the question knows, the Paris Conference did not even fix the amounts of the reparation payments assessed against Germany and the other defeated nations. It took another two years of bickering before the fantastic sums which became the official obligations of the reparation debtors were determined by the Reparation Commission. Then followed a period of three years during which attempts were made to collect the uncollectible, culminating in the Franco-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr. Not until that strange interlude had reached its own culmination in the complete economic and financial collapse of Germany did the next important chapter in the reparation story begin through the appointment of the Dawes Committee of Experts.

It is at this point that General Dawes's diary picks up the story. The documentary portion of the volume is most welcome. In addition, the general's pithy and at times characteristically racy observations make fascinating reading, although his belief, unequivocally expressed and apparently fully shared by his colleagues, that the experts were fixing annual installments within Germany's capacity to pay and within the creditors' willingness to receive, has the ring of incredible naïveté, to say the least, especially in the light of subsequent history.

There were other chapters in the reparation story before the whole



question finally went the way of the rest of the Treaty of Versailles: the Young Plan, the Hoover Moratorium, the Lausanne Conference. They, as well as the interval between the periods covered by Mr. Burnett and by General Dawes, still await detailed and painstakingly documented treatment.

*Washington, D. C.*

LEO PASVOLSKY.

*Majority Rule in International Organization: A Study of the Trend from Unanimity to Majority Decision.* By CROMWELL A. RICHES, Associate Professor of Political Science, Goucher College. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. Pp. viii, 322. \$2.75.)

PROFESSOR Riches has made a real contribution to the understanding of the modern trend toward international organization. His careful study of the slow progress going on in the organs of the international society "toward the acceptance of the majority device in reaching decisions" (p. 7) contains an exhaustive study of the instances in which decision does not require unanimity and an interesting analysis of the different types of situations in which the sovereign states have been willing to permit an international organ to act otherwise than by unanimous consent. The author calls attention to the significant use of decision by a majority in the organs of the League of Nations, both those composed of government representatives and those composed of experts appointed by the League.

One cannot help being impressed by the trend toward conventions regulating the relations of individuals to public services or among themselves, which are so rapidly increasing and are one of the best evidences of the growing understanding in the fields of business and social regulation that the need for regulation in many fields transcends the scope of the jurisdiction of a national legislature. But such international conventions, to be put into effect, must have the approval of the national lawmaking or rule-making authority; and so to assure that acceptance by the group of states necessary to render these lawmaking conventions effective there must be compromises with dissident minority governments. Where public opinion has the last word, as in democratically governed states, an international convention proposing a rule to govern human relations must be alive to public opinion in each state and must not go beyond the limit which public opinion as well as governmental opinion will accept in at least the number of states necessary to make the convention effective.

The author has done a service in showing the different devices which have been used in different situations to adjust the necessity for action in the interest of the international society to the political division of that society into sovereign states. Regulatory conventions in our changing world society imply organs to adjust the rules to new conditions, and it is this which has



been in the past and will be in the future an urge toward the acceptance of one device or another to secure modification or extension in another way than by unanimous consent.

One of the most important of these devices follows a practice increasingly in use by national legislators, that of putting into the statute only the provisions setting up a new organization and setting forth the principles upon which and the limits within which it can act, then enacting regulations covering the many details required to make the principles effective and, while adhering to the principle of unanimous consent or nearly unanimous consent to changes in the statute, permitting an administrative body to modify the regulations by an easier process.

*Columbia University.*

JOSEPH P. CHAMBERLAIN.

#### ANCIENT HISTORY

*Tarente, des origines à la conquête romaine.* Par PIERRE WUILLEUMIER. With a volume of plates. (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1939. Pp. vi, 752. Plates XLVIII.)

THIS stout volume, published as the one hundred and forty-eighth fascicle in the series of the Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, represents the goal to which a valuable series of special studies by the same author has been leading. M. Wuilleumier is already well known for a number of articles on problems of Tarentine archaeology, has had unusual opportunities to use the rich store of finds in the museum at Tarentum, and is well prepared to carry out his present task. That task, in brief, is to synthesize anew all the evidence relating to free Tarentum, literary and archaeological alike, in order to present a comprehensive picture of the many aspects of its history and culture. Such a treatment of any ancient city runs the risk of being too discursive and disconnected and at some point of taking the author beyond his special fields of knowledge. M. Wuilleumier has been unusually successful, if not wholly so, in avoiding these hazards. In its general outlines his work will stand as an exceedingly useful repertory of things Tarentine.

Initial sections discuss the pre-Greek peoples and the foundation legends. The author believes that the Tarentines came from Amyclae after the Spartan conquest. Then follow résumés of Tarentum's foreign relations, with special emphasis upon the regimes of Archytas and Pyrrhus, and of the scanty evidence for its constitution, inner political changes, army, and mode of life. These lead to the most satisfying and important portion of the work, an account in some 230 pages of the achievements of Tarentum in architecture, sculpture, bronze work, precious metals and coins, terra cottas, and ceramics, in which the author makes use of much unpublished material. Religious and intellectual life receive due consideration, with special reference to Pythagoreanism, Orphic and Dionysiac rites and beliefs, the south Italian theater, and the achievements of Archytas, Aristoxenus, and, in epi-

gram, of Leonidas of Tarentum. These subjects sometimes lead the author far afield, sometimes compel him to be content with summaries, but they contribute to the general estimate of the influence of Tarentum which forms his conclusion. Appendixes on the dialect and vocabulary of Tarentum bring together much interesting and out-of-the-way material. A separate folder of forty-eight plates is rather poorly finished but contains new material of value.

A work of this scope will not win general agreement on all points. Tarentum is perhaps given too great a part in the Samnite wars (pp. 83 ff.), and it is hard to believe that the "old" treaty violated by the Romans in 282 B.C. dated only from 302 (p. 95; cf. *Cambridge Ancient History*, VII, 640). Like the ancient sources, the author wavers between the view that thirty thousand Tarentine slaves became prisoners of Rome and that thirty thousand Tarentines were sold into Roman slavery, and he misstates Frank's view (p. 162, n. 4, and p. 173). Supposed Tarentine types—a head of Apollo, a flower, a dolphin, a horseman—on the coins of the Marcian and Calpurnian families in Rome are weak evidence that the *Ludi Apollinares* came from Tarentum (p. 679). More might perhaps have been made of the relationship between Tarentine farce and Roman popular drama (cf. A. M. G. Little, *Harvard Studies*, XLIX [1938], 205 ff.). On the other hand, the author's doubt that Livius Andronicus came from Tarentum as early as 272 (p. 686) receives support in Beare's recent article (*Classical Quarterly*, XXXIV [1940], 11 ff.). The volume would have been improved by further proofreading. An amusing infelicity of expression absolves Cicero from responsibility for the death of Plato! (p. 608). These, however, are minor points. M. Wuilleumier has deserved well of students of both Greek and Roman culture.

Bryn Maur College.

T. R. S. BROUGHTON.

*The Greek City, from Alexander to Justinian.* By A. H. M. JONES, Fellow of All Souls College. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1940. Pp. x, 393. \$7.00.)

WITH his publication in 1937 of *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* Mr. Jones promised that it would be followed by a study which would "draw together the scattered threads obscured in this work in a tangle of facts". The present volume fulfills this promise. The two books cover approximately the same periods and areas, but, where the earlier study was intended almost exclusively for advanced students, its successor should prove to be of real interest as well as value to college students and the general reader in addition.

The author defines a Greek city as "any community organized on the Greek model and using Greek for its official language". He discusses the diffusion of the city, relations with the suzerain, internal politics, the civic services, and the economic, political, and cultural achievements of the cities. Though criticism may be offered on a number of points, the reviewer would

suggest only that a certain lack of balance and perspective arises from the tendency of Mr. Jones to underrate the significance of contemporary non-Greek cultures and to neglect, in his evidence, archaeological material other than inscriptions and architecture.

The strongest motivation for the diffusion of the Greek city Mr. Jones finds not in the activity of rulers, and only secondarily in the settlement of Greek colonists, but in the spontaneous demand on the part of the upper classes among the natives who had become ashamed of their own cultures and had completely adopted that of their conquerors. He emphasizes the deep-seated mutual distrust and disloyalty which marked the relations between the cities and the Hellenistic kings and the refusal of the latter to make any real use of the city organization. The Roman and Byzantine overlords, though they viewed the cities as fiefs, no longer mistrusted them and made increasing use of them as administrative agents. But here again the author emphasizes the essential failure of the mutual relationship. The constantly increasing duties imposed on the cities are called menial and uninteresting, incapable of inspiring a sense of responsibility or loyalty. Though the emperors labored to preserve the cities as fiscal agents, little was done to correct internal abuses or encourage a healthy economic structure.

In assessing the achievements of the cities in the economic field Mr. Jones argues that for most cities both trade and industry were largely confined to luxuries and could have been of little importance; the greater part of the wealth, therefore, must have been derived from the ownership of land and was concentrated in the hands of a minority. His conclusion is that the economic life of the cities was unhealthy and that they were "economically parasitic on the country-side".

Judged by the standards of democracy, the political contribution of the cities to their own life is called "far from successful", and no contribution was made to the political life of the surrounding towns and country. Though the wide diffusion of city forms during the Hellenistic period carried with it the tradition that the democratic was the only natural form of city government, the author points out that even then, prior to the deliberate installation of oligarchies by the Romans, a convention had grown up awarding a virtual monopoly of office to the wealthy.

After discussing the contributions made in the various fields of culture, Mr. Jones finds that while much of the culture of the Greek East was banal and lacking in originality, it did achieve a remarkably wide geographical distribution. But in these fields, too, only to a limited degree did the benefits spread downward to the masses within as well as without the cities. In conclusion he states that in large measure "the history of Graeco-Roman civilization is the history of the cities" and that "the ancient world evolved no larger loyalty than that of the citizen to his native town". The cities were "the motive power which kept the mechanism of society in action"; and catastrophe followed the early failure of Rome to keep alive a healthy politi-

cal and economic structure within the cities and direct the forces of civic patriotism into the service of the empire.

*University of Michigan.*

ROBERT H. McDOWELL.

*Les distributions de blé et d'argent à la plèbe romaine sous l'empire.* Par DENIS VAN BERCHEM. (Geneva: Georg & C<sup>ie</sup> S. A., Librairie de l'Université. 1939. Pp. 185. 5 fr.)

THIS book, by an author whose studies on the social history of ancient Rome have already appeared in a number of French periodicals, represents a stimulating and original attempt to revise the accepted interpretation of one of the most interesting social and economic institutions of imperial Rome. In supplying the population of their metropolis with free corn, the emperors continued, as they did in many other instances, a tradition which they had inherited from the republic, and Van Berchem therefore begins his work with an analysis of the *frumentatio* as it was practiced under the republic.

Long before the empire the authorities had enforced measures designed to prevent the abnormal rise in the price of the most important food commodity, corn; in the days before the conquest of territories beyond the Mediterranean the state, when emergencies arose, purchased corn supplies for sale to the needy at minimum prices. The social character of the reform of Gaius Gracchus is indisputable; his *Lex Sempronia* of 123 B.C., which was directed against speculation on the corn market, was not so much an eleemosynary measure as an official recognition of every citizen's right to demand low prices from the state for that most essential food product. In our opinion, Van Berchem is correct in his interpretation of the next stage in the development of this liberal policy—the reform of Clodius in 58 B.C. According to Van Berchem, the only innovation introduced by the *Lex Clodia* consisted of a replacement of *cheap* corn offered on sale to the citizens by *free* corn distributed among them. (Thus the custom practiced earlier in some cities of the Hellenistic East—for instance, in Samos—was adopted by Rome.) Van Berchem is convincing in his discussion of the assertions of later ancient historians—Dio Cassius and Plutarch—that only the indigent element of the plebs profited by these corn distributions. It seems that these historians were misled by the situation as it actually existed: *de facto* only the needy citizens availed themselves of this privilege, but *de jure* the well-to-do were not excluded. (This is attested by Appian for C. Gracchus's reform.)

One of Van Berchem's original theses is the belief that the liberal principles of the *Lex Sempronia* were not given up during the later revisions of the *frumentatio*; here he is at odds with the prevailing theory as it was first formulated by Mommsen and later supported by Rostovtzeff. In his attempt to explode this theory Van Berchem, in our opinion, has not been successful. His arguments fail to prove that Caesar's reform was not conceived as a charitable measure exclusively to protect the needy. The rapid increase in

the number of those who availed themselves of free corn made it imperative for Caesar to devise measures for dealing with the problem. His *recensus*, which resulted in the registration of 150,000 citizens entitled to the *frumentum publicum*, could be based only on one criterion: the financial status of the individual citizen. As for the *recensus* carried out by Augustus, Van Berchem does not disprove the theory of Cardinale and Rostovtzeff that Caesar's successor had in mind the investigation of the income of all citizens with a view to striking from the lists all those who were not actually in need. In his effort to answer the question, who under the empire were entitled to receive the corn dole, Van Berchem, rejecting the theory that the emperors followed the Augustan precedent and admitted to the corn dole only those in need of charitable assistance, is compelled to formulate a new theory. He fails to convince us, however, that from the days of Augustus any member of the *plebs Romana* domiciled in Rome was *ipso facto* entitled to the corn dole. He considers this privilege as inherent in the political rights of the citizen, but he fails to note that this right did not belong to the citizen automatically but needed an official sanction, which was manifested by the appearance of the individual's name on the free corn list. For this reason the distinction between the corn dole and the *congiaria*—the distribution of money among the poor of Rome—was perhaps not as sharp as Van Berchem believes. He considers the money distribution as an act resulting purely from the generosity of individual emperors, but he forgets that in the final analysis the privilege of receiving the dole also depended on the good will of the imperial administration, which could deprive the citizen of it by striking his name from the list.

Although Van Berchem does not convince us that the corn dole is not a "social institution" but rather a "political" one (p. 177), he does contribute largely to our store of knowledge regarding the distribution of corn and money in imperial Rome.

*University of Nebraska.*

MICHAEL GINSBURG.

*Urbanization and the Franchise in Roman Gaul.* By NORMAN J. DEWITT. (Cleveland: Campus Book Store, Western Reserve University, 1940. Pp. v, 72. \$1.00.)

THIS book is a continuation of DeWitt's investigations in the Gallic field. It is a revision of the latter part of his dissertation, published in 1938 under the title of *The Romanization of Gaul*, and must be reviewed in the light of his purpose, which is, he says, "prompt presentation of postgraduate researches". As such it is necessarily incomplete. For example, the discussion of enfranchisement of individuals in Gaul would be of greater value to the student of Gallic history and civilization if it were superimposed upon a background of discussion of the enfranchisement of groups or communities in Gaul. That more complete treatment will perhaps be a part of a later

work. In its present form the book has much of value and interest in a field which has been somewhat neglected.

It is divided into three chapters, dealing with the policies of Caesar and Augustus in Gaul, with urbanization in Gaul after Caesar, and with the bestowal of the *civitas* upon individual Gauls. The writer argues to the point that a "liberal and tolerant attitude on the part of Roman administrators" in the early empire fostered the Romanization of Gaul. In several details, for example, the discussion of the way in which Caesar dealt with Gallic *civitates*, grouping them as "foederatae", "liberae", and "stipendariae", one is reminded of Rome's treatment and grouping of Italian communities with nicely determined gradations of rights and privileges in an earlier period. Such a comparison is ignored and, if included, would tend to vitiate to a degree DeWitt's evident belief that Caesar was an innovator. This is, of course, a highly debatable point. A. N. Sherwin-White's fine study, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford, 1939), takes the opposite point of view. H. Rudolph, on the other hand, is firmly convinced that Caesar did not adopt and continue old Roman policies but initiated striking changes of his own, particularly in municipal legislation (*Stadt und Staat im römischen Italien*, Leipzig, 1935). Further evidence and proof for either view in its relation to Gaul would be of the utmost value.

The second chapter, "Old and New Towns in Roman Gaul", possesses great interest because it is an evidently painstaking study of a neglected phase of classical research, urbanization. It discusses the motives that possibly gave rise to the foundation of new Gallic cities or the transposition to new sites, which was general in Gaul after Augustus. The tenable hypothesis is advanced that the assurance of peace caused such developments spontaneously and that they were no part of deliberate policy on the part of the Roman government. The whole subject of urbanization from the period of the Third Mithridatic War to the second century A.D. is a provocative one. Much intensive research has obviously been expended upon this phase, as is evidenced by the extended index of Gallic towns. Further amplification of this inquiry would be most welcome.

Hunter College.

MARIE L. VAGTS.

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY

*The Monastic Order in England: A History of its Development from the Times of St. Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 943-1216.* By Dom DAVID KNOWLES. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1940. Pp. xix, 764. \$9.50.)

THIS is a book of unusual importance, not solely because of the very considerable quantity of information on the history and interpretation of medieval monachism that is to be found within its covers but even more

because the author, who gives ample evidence of sound learning and good judgment, is objective in his treatment of his subject and at the same time shows a sympathetic insight regarding it that no outsider could fairly hope to acquire. The work is divided into two parts. Part I, "Historical", opens with two introductory chapters on the Rule of St. Benedict and the monastic order between the death of St. Benedict and the times of St. Dunstan and continues with twenty chapters that trace the history of English monasticism. Part II, "Institutional", devotes sixteen chapters to the interior polity of the black monks, the work and influence of the monks, the external relations of the monastery, and monastic discipline, together with a chapter on the white monks (who have already received no little attention *passim*) and a concluding chapter that is a review of the entire period. Twenty-three appendixes, a group of tables showing the derivation of English monasteries, and an ample bibliography add to the value of the work.

It can readily be seen that the scope of Dom Knowles's work is such that this book can be profitably used by students of things medieval whose particular interests are widely variant. The student of church history is immediately addressed; but there is much to be gleaned in these pages concerning the feudal and secular organization, social structure, economic development, and medieval learning. The writer depicts, too, the Continental background whence originated the impulses that met with notable response in English monasticism; and not the least valuable of his pages are those given over to word pictures of abbots and other ecclesiastics whose careers and characters stamped their image and superscription on English monastic history. Without exaggerating the importance of the monks he makes clear how monasticism "was woven into the texture of contemporary society and economic life" (the words quoted are from a review in another journal) in addition to its being a force to be reckoned with in the spiritual and intellectual progress of the Middle Ages; and in dealing with the last part of his period (the years 1175-1216), when signs of decline are evident, he shows without special pleading how the decreased part that monasticism was playing in the life of the country can fairly be attributed in part to the growth of secular organization, the better quality of the hierarchy, and the general improvement that was connected with the renaissance of the twelfth century. In consequence of these movements the monasteries were no longer "the main spiritual and intellectual reservoirs of the country"; and it is also true that the internal development of the religious houses represented, the while, a wide and regrettable departure from the ideals of their founders.

Even in so admirable a volume as this there will be found mention only, or a treatment that seems inadequate, of some relevant topics; and there are some questions to which one may not be certain that Dom Knowles has given the right answer. Is the prototype of the Benedictine abbot to be found in the monarchical city-bishop or in the Roman *paterfamilias*? The first view



is taken by Knowles; the late Abbot Butler stressed the other. One might wish for further and clearer discussion of the vexed point of episcopal jurisdiction over religious houses; there is room for additional information on the archidiaconal jurisdiction of some English monasteries; the endeavor to explain what was meant by *conversi* is anything but illuminating. (Candor requires that one quote from appendix xxiii: "Clearly the matter needs further investigation.") On this point I would venture to suggest that Dom Knowles's difficulty comes in part from his familiarity with modern usage, which makes it hard for him to see that when Lanfranc equates *conversus* with *monachus laicus*, he is stating a simple truth without implying that a *monachus laicus* could not be a "choir monk" just as much as was a monk in priest's orders. Probably Professor Lunt's *Financial Relations of the Papacy with England* came from the press too late for Dom Knowles to read it, or he would have corrected a footnote on page 580 and used some material to be found in Lunt that would add to what he tells us of the relations of English monasteries with the see of Rome. Appendix xiv, on grants of *insignia pontificalia*, is, I believe, incomplete; Jocelin, bishop of Bath, should be added to the list of monastic bishops given as appendix xii and Richard of Dover to the list given in a footnote on page 177. The only printer's error that I have noted is on page 396, where the first half of footnote 5 probably belongs in footnote 4. None of these errors of omission or commission should blind one to the fact that we are indebted to Dom Knowles for an outstanding contribution in the field of medieval studies.

*Washington and Jefferson College.*

ALFRED H. SWEET.

*Bracton De legibus et consuetudinibus Angliæ.* Edited by GEORGE E. WOODBINE. Volume III. [Yale Historical Publications, Manuscripts and Edited Texts.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1940. Pp. 412. \$7.50.)

WHEN, in 1910, Dr. Woodbine published his *Four Thirteenth Century Law Tracts*, students of English medieval law at once realized that an editor of exceptional gifts had appeared upon the scene. From the introduction to this edition of *Fet asaver*, *Judicium essoniorum*, *Modus componendi brevia*, and *Exceptiones ad cassandum brevia*, four of the tracts of the age following Bracton, it is clear that Dr. Woodbine had most carefully studied the textual relationship between this group of writings and the longer treatises of Glanvill, Bracton, Fleta, and Britton. These early studies were destined to be followed by others of even greater significance; for ever since completing his edition of the tracts Professor Woodbine has devoted his deep learning and ripe scholarship to the difficult and laborious task of producing trustworthy editions of Glanvill and Bracton, the two most important legal classics of the English Middle Ages.

The first volume of Dr. Woodbine's edition of Bracton's famous treatise appeared in 1915; it contained no text but dealt wholly with the manuscripts,



their pedigree, and the perplexing problem of the *addiciones*. The second volume, published in 1922, contained the first installment of the Latin text, about one third (ff.1-159b) of the entire treatise. In the third volume (1940) there is now presented the second installment (ff.160-317b) of the text; and, as the editor's work of collation has been completed, it is expected that the remainder of the text will soon be published in a further volume. In still later volumes there will follow Dr. Woodbine's commentary on the text, his English translation of the text, his introduction to the entire work, and the index. It is said to be the editor's expectation that his commentary will be published in at most three years; much of the material has already been collected.

In the long interval between the appearance of the second and the third volume (1922-40) Dr. Woodbine published his edition of Glanvill (1932), Bracton's twelfth century predecessor. Valuable as presenting a reliable and definitive text, this edition is also instructive as showing us not only the sources upon which Glanvill drew, such as royal writs, royal legislation, and the texts of Roman and canon law, but also the influence of Glanvill upon the *regiam maiestatem* and Bracton's treatise itself (on Bracton's extensive use of Glanvill see, *e.g.*, pp. vii, 184-85, 194, 228-30, 272). Just as Dr. Woodbine's knowledge of the MSS. of Bracton helped him in the preparation of his text of Glanvill, so his intimate acquaintance with the MSS. of Glanvill and of Bracton's thirteenth century successors is contributing materially to his marked success in giving us an authoritative edition of Bracton's work.

In preparing a new text of Bracton's *De legibus et consuetudinibus Angliæ* Dr. Woodbine has had as his main aim the formation of a text which will correspond as nearly as possible with the one which Bracton himself actually wrote. Many of the difficulties in the way of the successful completion of such a plan have been considered by Dr. Woodbine in his first volume, where he expresses the view that no existing MS.—not even the Bodleian "Digby" Codex—can claim to be a direct copy from the original (on the "Digby" Codex see pp. 5, 68 ff.), a view which is somewhat at variance with opinions expressed by Maitland in his *Bracton and Azo* (pp. 239-50). In the first volume as well as in the preface to the second Dr. Woodbine maintained that for at least the larger portion of the text there are three principal textual traditions. "It is on the basis of these traditions, and not on the readings of individual MSS.," he held, "that the restoration of the original text must rest"; and on the basis of the pedigree worked out in the first volume he has selected eleven MSS., as he tells us in the preface to Volume II (pp. vii, viii), and used them throughout as the representatives of the three main traditions. He has, however, occasionally referred to one or more of the other MSS.

Attention has already been drawn to the fact that one of Dr. Woodbine's outstanding contributions to the formation of a reliable text is his study of

the difficult problem of the *addiciones*, more particularly those additional passages not written by Bracton himself (see the review of Volumes I and II, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVIII, 301-304). As Dr. Woodbine has remarked in his preliminary observations on this problem: "There is too much matter in the traditional text of Bracton" (I, 312; see pp. 312-422). In the present volume, as in the second, textual "*addiciones* or doubtful passages" are enclosed in angular brackets. It may be expected that Dr. Woodbine, after he has completed the publication of the text, will give us further light as to the nature, scope, and authorship of this mass of *addiciones*.

In his first volume Dr. Woodbine informed us that "Including those which are fragmentary, abridged, or incomplete, there are forty-six manuscripts of Bracton's treatise accessible to scholars, with two, possibly three, others in existence which are not accessible" (pp. 1-20). In addition to these inaccessible MSS. and the forty-six that were used for the first third of the text (Volume II) two more have since come to light (see the preface, Volume III); they have contributed to the text in the present volume. One of these (British Museum, Add. MS. 41258), written in several different hands, *ca.* 1300, abounds in *addiciones* and is "textually of no great importance". The other MS., which was purchased by the Law School of Columbia University in 1932 and is now in the library of that institution, is written in a hand of the last quarter of the thirteenth century; it is, Dr. Woodbine says, "not only one of the finer of the Bracton MSS. artistically, but is also one of the more valuable textually". It is found to belong to the best of the three main textual traditions but is not the progenitor of the other MSS. in its group.

The publication of this third volume marks an important stage in the work of bringing to completion Professor Woodbine's great project of presenting to scholars an edition of Bracton's treatise which will conform to the exacting standards of textual criticism prevailing at the present day. The appearance of the remaining parts of the work will be awaited with eager expectancy by all scholars whose studies are concerned with the history of the early common law and with the juridical and political ideas of Bracton's age. The high value which attaches to Dr. Woodbine's comments on the text of Glanvill and the thirteenth century law tracts and the illumination furnished by his article on "The Roman Element in Bracton's *De adquirendo rerum dominio*" (*Yale Law Journal*, XXXI [1921-22], 827 ff.) give us every reason to expect that his commentary on Bracton's text will prove to be of special interest and importance. No doubt in the midst of his comments on larger and more important themes he will find space in which to explain the significance of the repetition of the words *in dominico* and *in servitio* (f. 272; see III, 296, ll. 6 and 7). As he informs us in the footnotes, some of the MSS. omit the duplication.

Harvard University Law School.

H. D. HAZELTINE.

*Incunabula in American Libraries: A Second Census of Fifteenth-Century Books owned in the United States, Mexico, and Canada.* Edited by MARGARET BINGHAM STILLWELL, Librarian, the Annmary Brown Memorial. [Bibliographical Society of America, Monograph Series, No. 1.] (New York: the Society. 1940. Pp. xlv, 619. \$20.00.)

BORN in 1919 as the *Census of Fifteenth Century Books owned in America*, this catalogue of incunabula, long since out of print and in great demand, attained its majority after twenty-one years in 1940 in a revised and much enlarged second edition. In the interim the number of owners, public and private, and the number of works represented have both nearly doubled, while the number of copies of these works which have passed from the Old World to the New has well-nigh trebled. This rapid acceleration in the transit of rare old books across the Atlantic may be compared to that coming of Greek manuscripts to Italy which preceded the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and which even anteceded the flight of Greek scholars that likewise came before rather than after that date. So these literary treasures and first-fruits of the invention of printing have forerun the subsequent fugitives to our shores from European universities and

“... echo farther West  
Than your Sires' Islands of the Blest.”

One would not wish certainly to compare incunabula to rats, but their westward movement and new frontiers may, nonetheless, be a sign of the sinking of European civilization.

The method of cataloguing which has been employed in this volume is brief, informing, clear, and to the point. Each title is given a number of its own which will prove very valuable for purposes of reference and identification. The format used is handy; the various fonts of type are convenient for the eye to follow. This is a volume which every student of periods before 1500 will wish to possess, but the price will unfortunately place it beyond the reach of many individual scholars, although those collectors who can afford to purchase the incunabula themselves will no doubt be able to buy it too.

Where so much has been given, one should perhaps not press for more. But a subject index of the various volumes here arranged alphabetically by authors—except in the case of anonymous works—would have been exceedingly interesting and serviceable, enabling one to find, for example, the scattered pest tracts, the treatises on usury and *montes pietatis*, commentaries on the different works of Aristotle, discussions of papal, ecclesiastical, and secular power, music, arithmetic, meteorology, feudal law, etc. It will do no one any harm, however, to look the entire catalogue through from cover to cover in search for his particular interest. Thereby he may pick up additional information and suggestion.

The Bibliographical Society of America and the editor of this volume and her helpers in the task might render a similar service, perhaps an even

greater one so far as scholarship is concerned, if they would follow this by another like undertaking, a catalogue of books printed in the sixteenth century which are now to be found in this country, Mexico, and Canada.

*Columbia University.*

LYNN THORNDIKE.

*The Origin of Printing in Europe.* By PIERCE BUTLER. [The University of Chicago Studies in Library Science.] (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1940. Pp. xv, 154. \$1.50.)

*Printing in the Fifteenth Century.* By GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP, Rosenbach Fellow in Bibliography. [The A. S. W. Rosenbach Fellowship in Bibliography.] (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1940. Pp. xi, 158. \$2.00.)

THE five hundredth anniversary of the conventionally accepted date of the invention of printing has come and gone, with the when and the how and the by whom still obscure. Defenders of the "Coster legend" are quiescent, but the Gutenberg theory has been the subject of renewed study and re-examination of the evidence. All the documents in the Mainz case are at last being made available to readers of English, historians have realized the necessity of familiarizing themselves with printing technique, and the importance of commercial activity and metallurgical practices in the fifteenth century has received more consideration. No extended examination of the whole problem has appeared, but two recent small books should be noted.

One of these is Mr. Winship's Rosenbach Lectures on the printing of the fifteenth century, the other, Professor Butler's inquiry into the origin of printing in Europe. Mr. Winship's lectures are, as one would suppose, in the more popular vein, and since he knows a great deal about early printing, the book is a dependable short account. He takes the usual delight in dispelling myths, but both he and Professor Butler cling to the notion that the early printers did a good deal of filing of their type to reduce the size—in the case of the Gutenberg Bible particularly. The filing of small pieces of lead in quantity is, of course, possible, but, especially in view of Professor Butler's surmise as to the earliest method of casting, there has been a too ready acceptance of this theory of the use of the file.

The evidence for John Gutenberg is entangled and open to suspicion at various points. Mr. Winship suggests that he may have sold type down country to Coster at Haarlem; Professor Butler implies that Gutenberg's share in the invention was not so important as is commonly believed. The evidence of the "documents"—twenty-eight in Gutenberg's case, fifteen for Valdfogel of Avignon—is inconclusive even if they have not been tampered with or fabricated. And Butler has a definite idea that there was a deal of preparatory printing which has now vanished. The block books, he thinks—contrary to most writers—date well before the invention of movable types. Neither Winship nor Butler considers the ingenious theory advanced by Otto Fuhrmann (in *The Five Hundredth Anniversary of the Invention of*

*Printing*, 1937) that the Psalter of 1457 was begun *before* the Bible of forty-two lines. We have the Bible and the greater Psalter; as to their production, no "emphatic warrant" for the average reader is contained in either of the books under review.

The student of the mechanics of early printing, however, will be intrigued by Professor Butler's hypothesis respecting the early casting of type. The matrix used in hand casting has always been a flat bar of hard metal with the letter punched on the side; he substitutes for this a "prismatic" matrix with the letter punched on the *end*—like a Monotype machine matrix. Such a matrix could easily be used in a casting box consonant with the "four pieces" of the 1439 trial. Such a matrix and such a mold would mutually adapt themselves to different widths of type—and it would be easier to file down a matrix than its innumerable progeny. This is the most interesting contribution to the vexed question of early type casting which has appeared in many years, and with others of his hypotheses it makes us eager to see his promised expansion of his studies.

*Yale University.*

CARL PURINGTON ROLLINS.

*Portuguese Voyages to America in the Fifteenth Century.* By SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON. [Harvard Historical Monographs.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940. Pp. xiv, 151. \$2.00.)

IN recent years claims have been made that the Portuguese discovered North America and Brazil before Columbus. In this little book these claims are examined. Dr. Morison is a practiced sailor, and he relies on his own experiences to refute the library navigators. He believes that the Teive-Velasco voyage went northeast from Corvo toward Ireland in search of the islands of Man and Brazil as shown on the Pareto map of 1455. The João Vaz Corte-Real voyage of 1472 is based on such discredited evidence that it should never be revived by responsible historians. There is no good evidence that the Dulmo-Estreito voyage ever took place, certainly none that it discovered America. The Labrador voyages of João Fernandez are shown to have taken place after 1499, and Fernandez explored Greenland. Little need be said of the Corte-Real voyages of 1499-1502. They followed the Cabot discoveries. It is shown conclusively that Cabral could have been carried by winds and currents to the coast of Brazil. Other voyagers in after years were carried to the same coast even though they sought to avoid it. It is now known that the sailing directions which Vasco da Gama is reported to have given Cabral are authentic. Dr. Antônio Baião found the original text in the Torre do Tombo.

Did the Portuguese discover Brazil before Cabral? Possible evidence for such a discovery is found in the *ixola otinticha* legend on the Andrea Biancho map of 1448, in Mestre João's reference in the May 1 letter to the Pero Vaz Bisagudo map, in a series of depositions made years after the discovery, in certain conversations Columbus had with the king of Portugal, and finally in

a passage in Duarte Pacheco Peieira's *Esmeraldo de situ orbis*. It is alleged that this discovery was not revealed to the world because the Portuguese king followed a policy of secrecy about Portuguese discoveries.

Dr. Morison rejects all of this evidence as insufficient to prove any Portuguese voyage to Brazil before 1500. He comments, "the only evidence of a Portuguese discovery of America is the lack of evidence of a Portuguese discovery of America". The negative attitude toward any claims to a prior discovery of North America or Brazil is a very wholesome one. The honors due the discoverer should not be reawarded except on the soundest of evidence.

To the present reviewer it seems that all the writers on the subject of possible Portuguese knowledge of Brazil before 1500 have overlooked one important circumstance. Portuguese knowledge was based on theory, not discovery. Pierre d'Ailly's *Imago Mundi* contained the ideas of Aristotle, Seneca, Pliny, Roger Bacon, and Nicolas Oresme regarding the nearness of India to Africa. These concepts are contained in a legend on one of Pierre d'Ailly's maps reading as follows: "According to some [authors] the southern front [or border] of India is projected [or extended] to the Tropic of Capricorn. Her eastern side [extends] to near the limits of Africa." This legend probably is sufficient to explain the *ixola otinticha* legend, the reference to the Bisagudo map, the Columbus conversation with the king of Portugal, and much of the significance of Duarte Pacheco's reference.

*San Francisco, California.*

GEORGE E. NUNN.

#### MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary.* By E. HARRIS HARBISON.  
(Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1940. Pp. xii, 380. \$4.00.)

THROUGHOUT the Habsburg-Valois wars the position of England was peculiar. Although the English monarchy was certainly inferior in resources and military strength to either of the great contenders, it would be inexact to say that England was a "second-class power" without denying the implication that there was any other power in just the same class. England was, in fact, the only well-organized state in the area of conflict north of the Alps outside the orbit of the two leading powers, the only one capable, by virtue of its own strength and its strategic position, of influencing seriously the outcome of the struggle by its choice of sides. An English alliance, strengthened if possible by a dynastic tie, was, therefore, to both contenders an objective of the highest importance, and the English court, in consequence, was the scene of the most intense diplomatic activity. The interest of this struggle was heightened because at times of internal weakness England resisted with difficulty the pull of its greater neighbors and seemed in danger of becoming the permanent satellite of one of them.

The most dramatic episode of this struggle, and the one charged with the greatest consequences, was the duel between Henry II's ambassador, Antoine

de Noailles, and the ambassador of Charles V, Simon Renard, in the beginning of the reign of Mary I. The intrigues and counterplots of Noailles and Renard, indeed, provide for a time the leading theme of English history, but although the importance of their influence has long been recognized and not infrequently even exaggerated, there has been so far no really satisfactory account of their personalities and methods or of the course of their rivalry. There is now. Mr. Harbison has gone straight to the sources, utilizing for Noailles the voluminous files of his original correspondence preserved in the Archives du ministère des Affaires étrangères in Paris and for Renard the exhaustive transcripts from Simancas, Besançon, and elsewhere prepared by Mr. and Mrs. Royall Tyler for the *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish*. Neither mass of documents has been thoroughly worked before, and examination of them has been rewarded with fresh insights and illuminating illustration. These painstaking researches have been buttressed by a comprehensive and acutely critical survey of the pertinent printed literature, and the whole worked into a balanced and absorbing narrative which puts the diplomatic duel in its proper perspective and throws valuable new light on English history from the death of Edward VI to Mary's declaration of war against France in 1557.

While joining the author in regretting that considerations of space prevented more extended quotation from the unpublished correspondence, one feels confident of the accuracy and critical scholarship with which the fresh material has been used, and though it is possible also to regret that some problems touched on did not receive more extended treatment, particularly the vexed question of the relation between nationalism and religious radicalism as it affected the shift in English public opinion at the time of the Spanish marriage, one is obliged, on the whole, to applaud both the proportions of this able monograph and the caution with which its conclusions are presented. Perhaps the caution is pushed a little too far. In his preface the author suggests that he has been tempted to apply the lessons of sixteenth century diplomacy to contemporary events but recoils with the remark that "it is not the business of the historian to draw parallels". Pray, then, whose business is it?

*Long Island University.*

GARRETT MATTINGLY.

*The Voyages and Colonising Enterprises of Sir Humphrey Gilbert.* With an Introduction and Notes by DAVID BEERS QUINN, Lecturer in History, Queen's University, Belfast. Two volumes. (London: Hakluyt Society. 1940. Pp. xxix, 238; xiii, 239-534. 27s. each.)

THESE two volumes will promptly take rank as the fullest and most carefully edited record of the career and activities of Sir Humphrey Gilbert. The capital merit of the work lies in the circumstance that the student now has available a reasonably complete collection of the sources, which, taken together, show a colonizer actually at work, carrying on his several tasks and



functions: applications for a grant of privileges from the crown, the production of promotional writings to further the enterpriser's plan, negotiations to attract a migrating group to settle the lands granted, and illustrations of various arrangements to finance the ventures. We observe the foreign diplomatic reactions to the grant and the schemes based on it, and we are supplied with the narratives of the expeditions finally made by the enterpriser. We have before us some of the legal documents arising from controversies engendered in the course of the colonizing work. In addition to the well-known source materials there have been printed quite a few scraps and fragments drawn from a number of places. Of such documentation the Brudenell materials and the records transcribed from the high court of admiralty add most to our knowledge.

Dr. Quinn has done his duty well, and there will be no need to rework this ground for a long time to come. His account of the career and personality of Gilbert will stand. On one point in the historical introduction the reviewer wishes the editor had labored longer. The proposed migration to "Norumbega" in North America of a group of English Catholics in 1582 is still pretty obscure. By degrees this project is being brought out into full historical daylight. Dr. Quinn has contributed something new here, but this important problem in early Anglo-American history calls for future attention and additional labor. The perspective supplied by a reading of the Gilbert materials confirms the reviewer in his opinion that the Gosnold-Pring-Weymouth voyages to the "Norumbega" coast in 1602, 1603, and 1605 are most reasonably to be interpreted not as a new phase of the expanding English mercantilism of the opening years of James I's reign but rather as a return to, and a final trial of, a project originally drafted about two decades before and meant to be applied to "Norumbega" in the year 1582.

The editorial work has been well done; especially interesting are the results of Dr. Quinn's collations of Hakluyt's documents relating to Gilbert. The volumes are embellished with two likenesses of the adventurer: the Compton Castle portrait, almost contemporary, and the more familiar Holland engraving, dating from 1620. The editor has further enriched his text with facsimiles of pertinent cartographical materials: M. Lok's map, 1582; a portion of the Dee map of North America, 1580; and Gilbert's own chart of the boreal regions. A copious, well-classified bibliography is supplied, which will serve as an up-to-date summary of the literature on the subject. A few omissions may be noted: W. J. Harte, "Some Evidence of Trade between Exeter and Newfoundland up to 1600", in the *Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, LIV (1932), 475-84; R. G. Lounsbury, *The British Fishery at Newfoundland, 1634-1763* (New Haven, 1934); A. O. Meyer, *England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1916). The editor missed an item on Lady Gilbert's business troubles during her widowhood in 1586 (*Acts of the Privy Council, Domestic*, Vol. XIV) and another item on Sir John Gilbert in relation to a Newfoundland venture in 1589



(*ibid.*, Vol. XVII). The Hakluyt Society and the editor may take much pride in these valuable volumes.

University of California.

FULMER MOOD.

*Industry and Government in France and England, 1540-1640.* By JOHN U. NEF, Professor of Economic History, University of Chicago. [Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society.] (Philadelphia: the Society. 1940. Pp. x, 162. \$2.00.)

IN this book Professor Nef seeks to compare certain developments in France and England between 1540 and 1640. He examines industrial regulations and the enforcement thereof; royal participation in such industries as the manufacture of gunpowder, salt, and mining; and financial and agrarian policies which affected industry. In every case he finds that conditions in France were less favorable to the rise of large-scale industry than in England. His conclusions, though stated with care, seem in certain cases to go beyond the evidence available. Many of them could be supported only by extensive statistics or detailed local data, neither of which can be secured for this period. As examples of such conclusions the following may be cited.

Before the time of Colbert (1661-1683), with whom the establishment of extensive royal regulations over industry is sometimes associated, the crown already possessed almost as much authority as a royal despot could desire (p. 24).

All we know about the history of apprenticeship regulation suggests that the monarchs were much less successful in England than in France in their attempts to enforce the laws (p. 38).

In spite of the extensive system of industrial legislation built up in England, the actual regulation of industry was very much less effective than in France between 1589 and 1640 (p. 138).

The royal monopolies in England did less to interfere with the progress of private enterprise and industrial capitalism than the privileged manufactures in France (p. 139).

Professor Nef seems throughout to exaggerate the effectiveness of industrial regulation in France before 1661, to ignore the persistent difficulties in enforcement there, and to overrate the administrative activity and competence of the intendants under Richelieu. Nor does he seem to recognize how far the *manufactures royales* themselves were large-scale private industrial enterprises. If it is true that the fiscal and agrarian policies of the French crown interfered with the progress of business in France, it is also true that the royal encouragement and subsidization of private industry were more or less continuous in the period. Even in mining it is doubtful how far royal regulations or claims to special rights in minerals actually interfered with the development of mines.

Though in his conclusion Professor Nef states his thesis with the utmost caution and with scholarly reservations, still that thesis seems to be that government regulation of, and interference with, business in France checked

the rise of large-scale industry in many lines and that it was the rise of an industrial class in England which helped to create a freer government there in the seventeenth century. With the latter part of this hypothesis it is possible to agree, but with the former there are grave difficulties which Professor Nef himself recognizes. After 1661, in a period of persistent and fairly effective regulation, French industry of all sorts expanded rapidly, whereas in England, despite a decrease in effective regulation, the decades after 1640 were marked by less rapid industrial growth than the earlier period.

It is well-nigh impossible to untangle the threads of causation in such a complex web of fact, but it would be easy to maintain that the primary factor in the very rapid growth of industry in England in the century after 1540, as against the slower growth in France, was due primarily to the fact that during the period England was almost continually at peace and France was almost continually at war. In that century England had no important civil strife and no foreign war that was a real drain on its resources. France was engaged in foreign wars for eight years between 1542 and 1562. From 1562 to 1598 there was continual civil war and frequently foreign war as well. During the period from 1598 to 1635, when France enjoyed relative peace at home and abroad, her industries and commerce expanded rapidly, but from 1635 to 1659 she was engaged in foreign wars again. It would also seem possible to maintain that in some respects politics was more basic than economics, that France, for example, was able for the first time to institute effective regulation of industry after 1661 because she had developed a strong central government. England, on the other hand, had to abandon serious attempts at industrial regulation after 1660 because the instruments of an effective central government (strong privy council, prerogative courts, etc.) had been destroyed.

*Columbia University.*

CHARLES WOOLSEY COLE.

*French Pioneers in the West Indies, 1624-1664.* By NELLIS M. CROUSE. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1940. Pp. 294. \$3.50.)

THIS book fills a conspicuous gap in the literature of European expansion and is so well done that serious readers can only regret that the author failed to produce a definitive study. While assiduous use has been made of standard treatises and printed collections readily available in any large library, all manuscript material and recent French monographs bearing on the subject have been ignored, with the result that many essential details are missing, and the story lacks the finished touch which students have the right to expect. It may, of course, be that the outbreak of war prevented research in Europe itself. The notes accumulated on this side should then have been laid aside until better times, or, if their immediate exploitation was urgent, they should have been employed in producing a preliminary article or two on the subject. As things stand, with the book out, the author is unlikely to return to the project, while others who might subsequently be in a position to give

it fully rounded treatment will avoid it on the ground that it has already "been done". Premature publication has thus prevented an exceptionally able writer from realizing his full possibilities and has prevented a most inviting subject from receiving the scholarly attention it merits.

French activity in the Caribbean during the period under survey followed the conventional pattern of early overseas enterprise—a seigneurial grant to the Company of the Isles of America, defiance of that feeble corporation by ambitious governors who ultimately became proprietors of the lands under their jurisdiction, the passing of insular trade into the hands of interloping Dutch merchants, conspiracy and counterconspiracy in France, the founding of the mighty French West India Company to protect national interests in the area, and the dispossession of the old governors' families to that end.

The volume was, quite properly, conceived as a case study in colonial beginnings, and the writer never deviates from that purpose. The reproduction of three maps from Du Tertre's *Histoire générale des Antilles* (4 vols., Paris, 1667-71) was good in theory but has been poorly carried out and, in actual application, adds little to the work. Several odd slips have been noted. The famous vessel sent out to the American tropics by Sir Olive Leigh in 1605 was the *Olive Blossom*, not the *Olive Branch* (philatelists will recall that it graces the Barbadian commemorative stamp of 1906). Similarly, Antigua and Barbados were settled by the British, not the French, and have never been French—the former was merely raided by them in 1666 but was soon reconquered by the British, while the latter has always been under firm British control. The annotated bibliography and comprehensive index merit special mention.

George Washington University.

LOWELL J. RAGATZ.

*Sir William Temple: The Man and his Work.* By HOMER E. WOODBRIDGE, Olin Professor of English in Wesleyan University. [The Modern Language Association of America Monograph Series, XII.] (New York: Modern Language Association of America. 1940. Pp. xii, 361. \$3.50.)

SIR William Temple has suffered posthumous misfortune in being studied piecemeal. His versatility was, quite literally, his undoing. He has been castigated by Macaulay as a mugwump, that worse than Tory thing; his diplomatic activities in certain curious, troubled passages of English foreign relations have been frequently described; he has been identified as the architect of an interesting if short-lived constitutional experiment in quest of middle ground between absolutism and commonwealth; he is known to have broken new ground in his theory of history; he has been studied as a philosophical *libertin*; he is well known as critic, essayist, and letter writer; he has been criticized as patron of Swift; he has been glimpsed as the romantic inspiration of Dorothy Osborne's charming letters. All this is enough to daunt all but the stoutest-hearted among biographers, and they have been

daunted, for, until now, the only attempt at a full-length portrait of Temple has been Courtenay's life, published in 1836. This was honest and accurate within its limits but obtuse and unsympathetic in treatment. Since that date much additional source material has come to light, and several special studies have been written which make easier an appreciation of the range, originality, and experimental soundness of Temple's thought.

Professor Woodbridge has tested and supplemented these by patient study of Temple's works from least to best and has produced an admirable and definitive biography. Admirable for comprehensiveness, moderation, and lucid brevity—this last difficult to attain, especially in dealing with the confused political history in which Temple played a part. Definitive—a risky adjective—because substantially the facts that are likely to be known about Temple are here presented in their reasonable relationships. Readers of Temple's works and this biography may differ with Professor Woodbridge and among themselves about Temple's character, about the degree of his effectiveness in action, about the merits of his literary style. The reviewer admits to being not altogether cured of a conviction that Temple was vain and given to holier-than-thou attitudes, though eminently likable. He was a poor judge of men, and when disillusioned he reserved the right to withdraw. But whether it is a right or no in the circumstances in which Temple exercised it may still be questioned. The biographer will sigh over this as a reversion to Macaulayan heresy. His analysis and appraisal of Temple's works and their affiliations with the thought and controversies of his time are so well done that I cannot suppose they will need redoing. Among many contributions of scholarship and insight one may cite the correction of long-current misunderstanding of Swift's relations with Temple; the emphasis on Temple's philosophic tolerance, which disabled him for the bitter choice between political extremes; recognition of the political intention underlying Temple's works published between 1668 and 1674 and evident in his treatment of William of Orange in his memoirs; the interesting discussion of the *Observations upon the United Provinces of the Netherlands* and of the impression which it made on other writers. Temple's political acumen is illustrated by a startling passage from *Of Popular Discontents* which describes the processes by which free nations are induced to co-operate in their own enslavement (p. 250).

Professor Woodbridge makes no exaggerated claims of profundity or systematic and sustained reflection for Temple, but one who has read the book with the attention it deserves will agree with him as to "the extraordinarily suggestive and seminal quality of Temple's thinking in general. . . . He does not organize and settle the terrain over which he advances; he is a scout, a skirmisher, a pathfinder for later thinkers." No mean achievement, surely.

Vassar College.

VIOLET BARBOUR.

*De morbis artificum diatriba: Diseases of Workers.* By BERNARDINO RAMAZZINI. The Latin Text of 1713, revised with Translation and Notes by WILMER CAVE WRIGHT, Emeritus Professor of Greek in Bryn Mawr College. [The History of Medicine Series.] (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940. Pp. xlvii, 549. \$5.00.)

AN Italian physician, elected to the Viennese Academy in 1691, blushed as he read the diploma wherein he was christened Hippocrates III. In that same year he issued *Constitutio urbana*, concluding with the statement: "I write this amid the clash of arms, for the German troops, after the summer campaign against the French in Piedmont, are in winter camp with us. I fear that, owing to the lack of bread, there will be a new crop of diseases among us." The quotation practically identifies the author, for at that time the best minds in medicine still followed Vesalius in the pursuit of anatomy, and Bernardino Ramazzini (1633-1714) was one of the few who realized that "famine and pestilence are proverbially twins, and only a vowel distinguishes them in Greek: *limos* is followed by *loimos*". This was the man who, about a decade later, published *De morbis artificum* (Modena, 1700), which created the new study of trade diseases and industrial hygiene. Although in his later sixties and in frail health, it was characteristic of the punctiliousness of the author that he sat by the compositor and corrected his proofs. After a lapse of several years, when he could no longer see the printer's copy, the aged man published an improved and enlarged edition (Padua, 1713).

A remarkable panorama of miners, gilders, tinsmiths, blacksmiths, glass-makers, sulphur workers, ointment spreaders, plasterers and lime workers, cleaners of cesspits, fullers, oilmen, tanners, vintners and brewers, bakers and millers, makers of lute strings, tobacco workers, starchmakers, corn sifters and measurers, midwives, wet nurses, laundresses, bath men, salt-workers, printers, farmers, fishermen, soldiers, sailors and rowers, brick-makers and well diggers, weavers and carpenters, razor and lancet grinders, voice trainers and singers, workers who stand and workers who sit and workers who run, potters and porters and corpse bearers—all who work for their livelihood—vividly passes before the reader in this earliest systematic treatise on occupational diseases. The author is startlingly modern in his assertion: "I appeal to the people." This petted body physician of princes was deeply interested in all who labor amid unsanitary conditions. He wished to provide safeguards for those who earned their bread in darkness and dirt and dust. There is none to dispute with Ramazzini his title of father of industrial medicine.

The bilingual volume before us is the Latin text of Ramazzini's revised edition with an English translation by Wilmer Cave Wright, professor emeritus of Greek in Bryn Mawr College. A translation by Mrs. Wright, with its introduction, notes, and bibliography, is an event in American scholarship. With an author like Ramazzini and a translator like Mrs. Wright, there is nothing for a reviewer to do except to add his voice to the

general chorus of praise. A recent compendium on *Industrial Medicine* (New York, 1935) opened with the admission: "To most general practitioners Industrial Medicine is an unknown field." Mrs. Wright's version of Ramazzini's *Diseases of Workers* has given to our physicians the classic translation of the classic text in this field.

On the eve of Ramazzini's tercentenary Karl Sudhoff (1853-1938), the honored master of all the medical historians of his time, unveiled in the Museum of Social Hygiene of Dresden two bronze busts—one of Fracastoro and one of Ramazzini. Wilmer Cave Wright has likewise erected monuments to these names, not in bronze but in more enduring paper: her translation of Fracastoro's *De contagione* (1930) and, a decade later, of Ramazzini's *De morbis artificum* (1940) are the definitive editions of the most important works of these two pathfinders in medicine.

New York City.

VICTOR ROBINSON.

*Johnson without Boswell: A Contemporary Portrait of Samuel Johnson.*

Edited by HUGH KINGSMILL. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1941. Pp. xii, 306, x. \$2.50.)

A minor but stubborn feud divides the Johnsonians from the Boswellians. The former see their hero as the focus, with Boswell the biographer as merely an amanuensis of greatness and Boswell the man as a terrier trotting at the master's heels. The latter rate Boswell as an enchanting personality in his own right and the superior of his idol in the arts of narrative and biography. (Compare the *Journey to the Western Islands* with *A Tour to the Hebrides* or *The Lives of the Poets* with *The Life of Johnson*.) Most eminent Victorians, from Macaulay and Carlyle to Leslie Stephen, were Johnsonians. But the last two decades, under the excitement stirred by the recovery of Boswell's private papers from Malahide and Fettercairn and the fine editorial work of Tinker and Pottle, have seen the scales tip in the other direction. Yet in England, perhaps even more than in America, the true Johnsonian still flourishes. The chief is Dr. R. W. Chapman of Oxford, present collector and editor of Johnson's letters. An amateur Johnsonian is Hugh Kingsmill, who in 1934 published a well-written but routine life of Johnson—a book which went so far as to ignore the floods of new light upon Boswell cast by American research.

Now, in *Johnson without Boswell* Mr. Kingsmill pieces together, in sequence partly chronological and partly topical, the main non-Boswellian sources for Johnson's life story. The editor's comment is pared to a minimum. It consists chiefly of a brief introduction, in which he remarks that "many readers of Boswell have come to feel that his Johnson is too static, a character and an oracle rather than a human being whose life changed from year to year, whose nature felt desire and experienced frustration". Stepping aside, Mr. Kingsmill then calls up Mrs. Thrale, Sir John Hawkins, Fanny Burney, Anna Seward, Hannah More, Frances Reynolds, and a few others

to retell the ever fascinating story of that life. The result (perhaps unforeseen by the editor) is a prevailingly feminine point of view—a rearrangement of light and shade upon Johnson's rugged visage which brings out his courtliness and his pathos, his struggle with illness and gloom, and his craving for womanly understanding and companionship. In Boswell these aspects are often subordinate to the masterful Johnson, controversialist of club and tavern, diner-out and walker of midnight streets, the enemy of cant and bad logic. The material is, of course, not new; it has long been familiar to the reader of G. B. Hill's *Johnsonian Miscellany*. Johnson's letters, here quoted liberally, are available to every student, but to the average reader they are less well known than Boswell's pages and therefore have the savor of fresh disclosures. Those who recall Boswell's puzzling over Johnson's purpose in collecting orange peel will find the answer in Johnson's letter to Miss Boothby on December 31, 1755; other similar if trivial topics in the great biography are here set in new lights. Moreover, wherever Boswell is mentioned by these lesser associates of Johnson, the tone is often disparaging or hostile; they could not rid themselves of a natural envy at Boswell's appropriation of their guide, philosopher, and friend. Boswell in turn was prone to play them down. His feud with Mrs. Thrale made him pass perhaps too lightly over Johnson's deep romantic feeling for that lively lady. In Mr. Kingsmill's composite story the climax comes with her decision to marry Piozzi, the singing master, and the heart-struck injury it caused Johnson, who "abandoned his lifelong struggle with his inborn melancholia, dying within five months of her marriage". Readers of Boswell seldom suspect that Johnson, the gruff and self-sufficient, died of a broken heart.

Yet, after Mr. Kingsmill's witnesses have spoken their parts, one is left with an undimmed admiration for Boswell. If he did not give us the complete Johnson, the blame goes to Fanny Burney and others who refused to help him "entwine a wreath of the graces" across the sage's brow. Boswell did the best he could, and his best was magnificent. Stories that have become classic in his pages are retold with vastly inferior effect by Mr. Kingsmill's witnesses—such as Mrs. Thrale's account of Johnson's journey to church with the bride of his youth or Arthur Murphy's tale of Johnson's dealings with Chesterfield. When all is said and done, Johnson without Boswell is a noble fragment, not a unified and compelling reality. The Latins had a phrase for it: *ex pede Herculem*.

*University of California at Los Angeles.*

DIXON WECTER.

*Lazare Carnot, Republican Patriot.* By HUNTLEY DUPRE, Professor of History, University of Kentucky. [Foundation Studies in Culture, Volume I.] (Oxford: Mississippi Valley Press. 1940. Pp. viii, 343. \$4.50.)

THIS valuable book, the only work of its kind in any language, is a rich mine of information on one of the least carefully studied of the major revo-



lutionaries. But it is a mine that still requires some working on the part of the reader. The author's researches took him through the better-known public archives of France, and he also had the rare opportunity to consult the private archives of the Carnot family. It is manifest, even from the first cursory appraisal, that Professor Dupre moves with authority and assurance through the field of revolutionary scholarship. More careful rereading reveals still more conclusively that he has read widely and diligently in the secondary literature and is fully abreast of the arguments and refutations of the specialists. It is, therefore, a little surprising to find him leaning so heavily upon the general treatments of French militarism in the eighteenth century and equally surprising, from a positive point of view, to witness his reliance upon Phipps's studies for the campaigns of 1794, and negatively, to find no mention in that connection either of Carnot's *Correspondance* or of the several monographs of the major staff of the French army.

If he moves with assurance, that is not to say that he moves with ease. There is a curiously amorphous quality about his volume that must arise, the reviewer is convinced, from a basic structural weakness, *viz.*, the author's failure to make up his mind for what audience he was writing. Thus, if he is addressing the more general reader, his story is too literal and too factual, too swamped with the minutiae of intrigues and maneuvers which only confuse that reader if he takes the trouble to follow them. If the appeal is to this group of readers, as it clearly seems to be on occasion, then one has a right to criticize him for not giving more of the nonpolitical background and more of the personal and private life of the sober Carnot. If, on the other hand, the work is for the professional *aficionados* of the Revolution, as for the most part it seems to be, then there is far too much painting in of the background, too much running history of the larger movement, with which presumably they are already familiar. This indecision is all the more regrettable in that it keeps the author from etching his subject more sharply and from bringing to a focal point the characteristics of Carnot's thinking and actions. This serious criticism apart, the book will take its place as a necessary work of reference for every advanced student.

*Sarah Lawrence College.*

LEO GERSHOY.

*Les Vendéens, 1793: La "Grande Armée", la vie régionale.* Par JOSEPH DEHERGNE. (Zi-ka-wei, Shanghai: Imprimerie de T'ou-sè-wè. 1939. Pp. 529. \$2.65 postpaid.)

To the literature on the Vendean war, as partisan as it is voluminous, M. Joseph Dehergne, a missionary in the Far East, has added a rather strange contribution. His book defies precise classification. In part a narrative of the war from its inception in the March conscription riots to the annihilation of the *Grande Armée* of the Vendée at Savenay in December, 1793, in part a tableau of the social and cultural background, in part an uncritical



bibliography, in part an album of illustrations, and equipped with topographic and subject indexes, it comes as near to being an inchoate dictionary of the Vendée as anything else.

The narrative is strictly partisan, an interpretation in sheer contrasts: on the one hand, the vices of the republican generals, the cowardice of the republican troops, and the massacres committed by the Blues; on the other, the virtues of the Vendean chieftains, the courage of the Vendean soldiers, and no mention at all of the nameless atrocities practiced by the Whites. Nor does M. Dehergne add anything new to this clerical-royalist version of the Vendée. He leans heavily on secondary works of the most divers sort, from impressionistic (*e.g.*, René Bazin, *La terre qui meurt*) to scholarly (*e.g.*, Émile Gabory, *La révolution et la Vendée*). He either ignores, however, the works of republican historians, even the basic studies of Charles Chassin, or he cites them only to take issue with them. He is perhaps at his best when dealing with the lesser episodes of the war, for here his naïve treatment of his subject, coupled with his intimate knowledge of the customs and the country of the Vendéans, re-creates the atmosphere of the Catholic Vendée. But his account of crucial events often loses itself in a maze of indiscriminate detail or blurs into value judgments. Thus his description of the battle of Cholet (October, 1793) is confused and fragmentary, and his pages on the decisive night battle of Le Mans (December, 1793) are principally devoted to commiseration for the Vendéans. The scenes are intrinsically tragic, and once more we are moved by the Vendean epic. But our knowledge of it is not furthered.

The bibliography, distributed under subject captions in the text, is useful not only for purely local history but for the general religious history of the Revolution as well, for it includes most of the recent material. Yet there are glaring omissions. For example, M. Léon Dubreuil's excellent *Histoire des insurrections de l'ouest* (2 vols., Paris, 1929-30) is not cited. The section on the Vendean background is composed of disparate notes on the social and cultural life of Poitou under the old regime, and here one may glean curious details, such as the prowess of Mme. de La Rochejaquelein as a huntress of wolves, descriptions of rustic games, bits of old Poitevin songs, "ces airs dont la lenteur est celle des fumées". But perhaps the most valuable aspects of M. Dehergne's book are the reproductions of engravings, prints, and maps, many of them old and not readily available elsewhere.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

DONALD GREER.

*Some Letters from Livingstone, 1840-1872.* Edited by DAVID CHAMBERLIN.

With an Introduction by R. COUPLAND, Beit Professor of Colonial History in the University of Oxford. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1940. Pp. xxvii, 280. \$4.00.)

THE sixty-eight letters constituting the contents of this volume remind us that one hundred years ago David Livingstone started his brilliant career

as missionary and explorer in Africa. The great majority of the letters come out of the years of Livingstone's connection with the London Missionary Society, 1840-56. Only four of them come from the later years: two for 1858, one for 1860, and one for 1872. Correspondence for this part of Livingstone's career has been largely published, by Horace Waller, by H. M. Stanley, and in a parliamentary paper of 1872. This volume of letters is edited by the archivist of the London Missionary Society, although the pieces come from other than society sources. The editor has been more concerned with excising repetitious material than with explaining vague references to matters in need of the clarification a footnote can give. This criticism is of no serious consequence, for the value of the letters lies in the additional light they shed upon Livingstone's personality and character.

Livingstone was not a journalist of the sort who wrote of hazardous adventures and assigned himself a heroic role in them. He still appears as he did in Blaikie's biography, a somewhat humorless and very religious and introspective person at work in an environment that put to the full test all the versatilities of his practical nature. He seems as much concerned with his own spiritual well-being as with that of African natives. "I am conscious that though there is much impurity in my motives, they are in the main for the glory of Him to whom I have dedicated my all" (p. 160). He was led to explore because "Providence seems to call me to the regions beyond" (p. 153). He was deeply hurt by the criticism that his "object is to obtain the applause of men". "This bothers me", he writes, "for I sometimes suspect my own motives" (p. 160). But it was for Africa and its people that he really worked. He longed to see the continent opened to commerce and to the Gospel; he appreciated "the effects of commerce much, but those of Christianity much more" (p. 255). He was convinced that trade would drive out the slave dealer, that it would break up "the sullen isolations of heathenism".

It cannot be said that these letters add anything new to what many biographers and Livingstone himself have already told us; they simply serve to document still further the qualities of a man typical of the best in Britain in the nineteenth century.

*Yale University.*

HARRY R. RUDIN.

*The Beginning of the Third Republic in France: A History of the National Assembly, February-September, 1871.* By REV. FRANK HERBERT BRABANT, Canon of Winchester. [Studies in Modern History, General Editor, L. B. Namier.] (New York: Macmillan Company. 1940. Pp. xii, 555. \$6.25.)

THIS book presents to the reviewer a perplexing problem. It is unequal and confused both in content and in the evidence it gives of the materials that were used.

The narrative is not clear and is not improved by the interjection of

wordy and, in some instances, useless sketches and information. For example, the first chapter in Part II, entitled "The Palace and the Assembly", contains a long discourse on the physical attributes and appearance of the palace and many things that had transpired there since the reign of Louis XIV. The following chapter treats of the royalist party and the princes. There is a lengthy summary of the Right from 1789 through the Second Empire. Either this part should have been left out, or else clearer and more concise recitals of the essentials should have been made. Space saved might have been used for a more profound treatment of the peace and the Commune, which played a greater part in determining the history of the National Assembly between February and September, 1871, than Canon Brabant seems to believe.

Many statements are made in this book with which historians would take issue. It is hard, for example, to accept the author's characterization of the Revolution of 1848 as the "Revolution of the Romantics". Lamartine was not the only leader, and Victor Hugo's part was not one of leadership. Again, in chapter VIII the author treats the cleavage between Paris and the provinces in 1870 as new. Were not the earlier Revolutions of 1830 and 1848 in great part Paris programs?

The bibliography also presents the same character as the rest of the book. There are surprising gaps and omissions. It is unfortunate that the author has not included Calmon-Levy's edition of the *Discours de Monsieur Thiers*, which carries down to the last year of his life, and the omission of the *Souvenirs* of the Duc D'Audiffret-Pasquier (1938) is surprising. And Canon Brabant is not aware, apparently, that the first volume of the *Memoirs of the Duc de Broglie* was published in 1938.

In short, the treatment is confused and uneven, and the book presents nothing new in the way of interpretation; it is decidedly inferior to the more concise and excellent account given by D. W. Brogan in *France under the Republic*.

Yale University.

JOHN M. S. ALLISON.

*The Constitution of England from Queen Victoria to George VI.* By ARTHUR BERRIEDALE KEITH, Regius Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology and Lecturer on the Constitution of the British Empire at the University of Edinburgh. Two volumes. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1940. Pp. lv, 485; ix, 515. \$7.50.)

LIKE Professor Keith's other systematic treatises, this is a work of prodigious erudition. The prefixed table of judicial cases contains more than 550 entries; the footnotes bristle with the citation of statutes, standing orders, parliamentary papers, and parliamentary debates; and there is much reference to published letters, diaries, journals, autobiographies, and secondary works, the last including no fewer than sixteen of the author's previous

books. In the preface Professor Keith thus clearly states his purpose and indicates his view of the utility of constitutional history:

It is the aim of this book to give an account of the constitution as it stands today [these words were written at the end of July, 1939], based on the history of its evolution since the accession of Queen Victoria. Hence those matters have been stressed which are of essential interest as leading to the present state of affairs, and the problems of the immediate future have been fully discussed, for the main value of the study of constitutional history is the guidance which can be derived thence for dealing with emergent circumstances.

The work is divided into nine parts, which deal, respectively, with the constitution, the crown, the cabinet and its functions, parliament, parties and political opinion, the executive departments and their functions, the judiciary and its functions, the state and the people, and the state and religion. Between the writing and the publication of the book the present war broke out, and in a postscript to the preface mention is made of some ensuing events of constitutional importance.

Professor Keith does not subscribe to the view that the constitutional historian should strive for rigorous detachment and keep his own opinions of men and measures to himself. After reading in the preface that "the determination of the Jewish community [in Palestine] to ignore the generosity of the British people and to defy the British Government . . . presents unquestionably the best justification yet found for the German view of Jews as unworthy to be citizens", one is not surprised to find strong expressions of personal opinion scattered through the book. These, it must be admitted, tend to enhance its readability, as do rare bits of satire, such as the statement that the account which Lord Salisbury gave of his tentative negotiations through Lord Carnarvon with the Irish Nationalists "was marked by the strictest economy in truth", or that Lord Rosebery's decision to resign was reached "because the Premier and Sir W. Harcourt presented the amazing picture of complete agreement on a course of action".

There is some treading on highly controversial ground, notably in the discussion of the king as guardian of the constitution. In a previous book, *The King and the Imperial Crown*, published in 1936, Professor Keith devoted a chapter to this subject. His views on it have not met with universal acceptance; in fact they have encountered vigorous disapproval in Labor circles. He has not abandoned them, however, though he realizes the difficulties, and even the danger to the monarchy, involved in what he calls "the safeguarding of the constitution by royal intervention". He thinks that under certain circumstances the king would not be under obligation to act upon ministerial advice, that he might even be justified in refusing assent to a bill sponsored by his ministers and passed by parliament. His reply to the argument that the king is not neutral in issues between socialism and

capitalism and therefore not qualified to act as an impartial guardian of the constitution in conflicts between them will probably not convince socialists.

But what is incidental in the book should not be stressed at the expense of its essence. This is an important work, packed with reliable information and contributing materially to a better understanding of the English system of government as it existed on the eve of the present war.

Columbia University.

R. L. SCHUYLER.

*A Hundred Years of the British Empire.* By A. P. NEWTON, Emeritus Professor of Imperial History in the University of London, Fellow of King's College, London. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1940. Pp. 416. \$3.75.)

THE virtues of this book are many; it is written with clarity and precision; it preserves an even balance between colonies of settlement and colonies of exploitation; it joins together in logical sequence and in due proportion an extraordinarily large number of significant facts. Professor Newton has accomplished what he set out to do, to write the history of India, Australasia, Canada, the British West Indies, and that of the larger part of Africa during the last hundred years, leaving out nothing of importance.

As is inevitable, certain sections of the empire are more thoroughly covered than others. The writer's account of South African affairs and of the settlement of Australia are decidedly better than his story of India since the accession of Victoria. One really cannot do much with the history of that subcontinent during the last hundred years in a scant fifty pages, certainly not if one tries to include the various annexations, the Mutiny, Afghanistan, Indian nationalism, the opium wars in China, Gandhi, and the Government of India Act of 1935.

Professor Newton is an imperialist but not a flamboyant one. There is a good deal about Joseph Chamberlain in his book; but there is scant reflection of the emotive drive behind that Birmingham statesman. Rhodes, Curzon, and Cromer all appear in due course but hardly as men of flesh and blood. The author sticks to his facts and lets it go at that.

Occasionally he ventures upon a generalization which is doubtful. "Military conquest", he tells us, "has played little part in the founding of the British Empire." The statement is in general true if we substitute the word "Commonwealth" for the word "Empire", but even in this instance it is desirable to remember the South African War. In regard to the dependent empire "considerable part" should be substituted for "little part". Neither India, Burma, the Sudan, nor Hongkong was joined peacefully to the empire. One wishes that Professor Newton had frankly acknowledged the use of force in extending the scope of the *Pax Britannica*. To do so would add to, not subtract from, those portions of his book which truthfully point out the beneficial results of that administrative broadmindedness and tolerance which on the whole have characterized Britain's imperial rule.

In general, Professor Newton is best in dealing with the Dominions, and his brief analysis of the illogical yet effective machinery (or the lack of it) by which imperial affairs are conducted is excellent. The book has an index but no bibliography or reading lists, the reader being advised to consult the mammoth bibliographies of the *Cambridge History of the British Empire*.  
*Princeton University.* WALTER P. HALL.

*English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism.* By BRUCE TIEBOUT McCULLY, Instructor in History, College of William and Mary. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1940. Pp. 418. \$4.50.)

WITH commendable catholicity of interest, Dr. Bruce T. McCully, an American, writes on the origins of nationalism in India. He studied the subject in New York and subsequently completed his researches in London. But the one place he did not visit was India, and the one thing he did not do was to discuss his theme with Indian scholars. By its very nature nationalism is not a subject that can be satisfactorily studied exclusively from records. It is a pity to rely solely on herbarium specimens when the living landscape is available. A study-visit to India would have enabled Dr. McCully to obtain a more thorough and more comprehensive understanding of his subject and perhaps would have modified his evaluations. He would not have omitted all references to the vital contribution to Indian nationalism of the late Justice M. G. Ranade, nor would he have overlooked the social reform aspect of Indian nationalism. He would not have mistaken Mr. Budrudin Tyebji for a Parsee (p. 365), and he would have avoided calling Indians "natives" in a book published in 1940.

The author would have done well if he had defined "Indian nationalism" and "European culture" as "precisely" as he has defined "educated natives" (p. 176). His conclusions would have gained greatly in point and value if he had compared the origins of nationalism in India and in other countries. As it is, the book is almost wholly descriptive. Where Dr. McCully cuts in to comment, he either proves the obvious or betrays an intention to discredit the national movement in India.

The purpose of the book is to find the origins of Indian nationalism in the nineteenth century which led to the foundation of the Indian National Congress in 1885 and to evaluate its "national" character. The author seeks to prove that British domination, the English language, and European culture contributed largely to its development. This thesis hardly needed proving; the proceedings of the very first session of the Indian National Congress bear eloquent testimony to it. Dr. McCully, however, prefers to invest the thesis with a controversial character and takes elaborate pains to convict an imaginary opposition out of its own mouth. When Mr. (later Sir) Surendra Nath Banerjea acknowledged that the Indian National Conference of 1883 was the "outcome of English education", Dr. McCully puts it

that Mr. Banerjea "openly admitted" it, as if drawing a damaging confession from a hostile witness (p. 349).

The author is not content to record that Indian nationalism was a product of English education, British rule, and European culture, whatever the first and the last may mean. He seeks to establish a negative thesis: "Without the existence of the British regime and the element of foreign domination implicit in that system, the beginnings of Indian nationalism would be difficult to envisage" (p. 388). He seeks to establish not merely a coincidence but a correlation. After suggesting the correlation, however, he abandons it. He notes that nationalism developed in China, Persia, and Turkey without British domination, and he concedes that in India itself nationalism might have developed if the Moghul rule had continued. Finally, he drops the whole idea, remarking that it is idle to speculate upon what might have been (p. 388).

Again and again Dr. McCully emphasizes that Indian nationalism was foreign in every way and was permeated by foreign culture. Indian nationalists "invented little or nothing in the way of ideology"; they "imitated" European nationalists (p. 389). In the next breath he asserts that Indian nationalists "turned their backs on the enlightenment of Europe to romanticize about the superiority of their own Aryan ancestors" and sought a "revival of ancient Hindu values and ideals" (p. 390). Again, having dogmatized that it was "painfully evident" (p. 238) that the "concept of nationality had been unknown in ancient Hindu civilization" (p. 241), he adds: "To be sure, neither the Hindus nor the other races of India were dead to all sense of nationality and national feelings" (p. 239). With this difference, however, that Hindu nationalism "had never been marked by that narrow, fierce political grain characteristic of some nations" (p. 239) and had not been "seized with that spirit of aggressive nationalism which so radically changed the map of Europe in the course of the nineteenth century" (p. 238). We shall not yield to the temptation to examine whether this difference is something which should be painful to Hindu nationalism. Again, having conceded that the word "patriotism" was "not unknown in pre-British periods of Indian history" (p. 239) and that there was a Sanskrit doctrine that "mother and motherland are superior to heaven" (p. 239), Dr. McCully doubts whether patriotism existed in India "in the sense which nineteenth century Europe attached to it" (p. 239) and asserts the "traditional absence of patriotism or national feeling among the Hindus" (p. 240). He does not disclose why he expected ancient India to have the aggressive nationalism of modern Europe, why ancient Europe did not have it, why the absence of it should be painful at all, and if so, why it should not be as painful to Europe as to India. The fact is that in the sense in which Dr. McCully uses the term, nationalism is, in the words of Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes, "modern, very modern" (*Essays on Nationalism*, p. 29) and that "no nationality is fixed and static" (*ibid.*, p. 14).

*Nagpur, India.*

P. KODANDA RAO.



*The War Crisis in Berlin, July-August, 1914.* By SIR HORACE RUMBOLD.  
(London: Constable and Company, 1940. Pp. xvii, 372. 18s.)

SIR Horace Rumbold, who died last May, began his diplomatic career in Egypt in 1892 and served nine years under Lord Cromer, with intervals in Persia and India. After four years as counselor of embassy in Tokyo he was appointed in 1913 as counselor at Berlin under Sir Edward Goschen and lived through the hot, hectic July-August crisis of 1914, which forms the main subject of this volume.

Sir Horace had remarkable opportunities for observation of men and events in those critical days which preceded the World War. One might expect, therefore, that his book would both give a new and fresh interpretation of the immediate causes of the war and bring valuable new details of a personal nature of the way Europe stumbled into war. But in both respects it is disappointing.

As to new details, there are a few, but they are not very important. The author records his worry of mind because he feared Germany was delaying or failing to send the British embassy's telegrams promptly to London and cites one telegram which did not reach there for ten hours; and on one occasion Bethmann even asked him to send a message through the German embassy in London to make sure that it would be delivered safely. Some slight delay was not unnatural in view of the pressure on the wires, and an examination of the time taken by Berlin-London telegrams compares very favorably with that of St. Petersburg-London telegrams, which often suffered very long delays; at least one of Sir George Buchanan's telegrams from St. Petersburg never arrived at all. Sir Horace says that on leaving Jagow's office toward noon on July 25 he saw Moltke waiting to come in. This would be important, if true, because other evidence indicates that the chief of the general staff did not return to Berlin from his "cure" at Carlsbad until July 26. We suspect that in this case the author's memory has played him false. Sir Horace gives many interesting but not vitally important details of the very last days in Berlin—dining at the Hotel Bristol or the embassy, the never-ceasing din of "Deutschland über Alles", the disgraceful attack on the British embassy, his last visit to Jules Cambon, and the final departure of the special train with British officials and newspaper men from Berlin to Holland. After burning ciphers and others papers, he was helped by Mr. Joseph Grew of the American embassy to seal up the British archives. Mr. Grew also took charge of all of his personal belongings, which he received again two years after the war, when he became British minister at Berne. "Not a thing was missing."

As a history of the July crisis the volume leaves much to be desired. Sir Horace frankly says: "A whole library has been written on the subject, but it has not seemed to me necessary for my purposes to wade through it." He makes no mention of two of the most recent and complete accounts, those by Bernadotte E. Schmitt and Alfred von Wegerer. He is not acquainted with the full editions of the Austrian and Russian documents and



therefore falls into the mistake of quoting telegrams in the incomplete and inaccurate form published in the "color books" shortly after the outbreak of the war. He does use the complete edition of the German and British documents, which he incorporates at considerable length, but usually without giving any footnote references, so that it is not always easy to check his statements. In several instances he admits that he is merely summarizing accounts by Headlam (1915), Sir William Archer (1915), and Sir Charles Oman (1919), all of which were written on the basis of the "color books" during the period of war psychology and prior to the publication of the fuller and more reliable documentary collections. The only recent books that he has drawn upon to any extent are the two volumes of Theodor Wolff. He devotes a chapter to each of the "Fourteen Days", but as he does not always stick to this chronology, it is sometimes difficult to follow his narrative. He writes with restraint and without bitterness, but his conclusions, as one might expect from his sources and his 1914 impressions as well as from recent Nazi behavior, are wholly unfavorable to Germany.

Sir Horace returned to Germany in 1928 as British ambassador and remained until the spring of 1933. Perhaps the most interesting thing in his volume is the long dispatch of April 26, 1933, in which he very shrewdly sums up and forecasts the terrible dangers inherent in National Socialism.

*Harvard University.*

SIDNEY B. FAY.

*A History of French Commercial Policies.* By FRANK ARNOLD HAIGHT. [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of Economics and History, James T. Shotwell, Director; Commercial and Tariff History, Michael T. Florinsky, Editor.] (New York: Macmillan Company, 1941. Pp. xvii, 285. \$2.50.)

AN initial chapter of twenty-two pages covering the period from 1664 to about 1850 should not be called history or criticized as such. After such an introduction this book disposes of the short-lived French movement toward free trade under Napoleon III in twenty pages. Another twenty-nine pages carry the protectionist revival down to 1914—in all seventy-one pages to summarize the complex policies of 250 years.

Two brief chapters on wartime controls and plans for the future complete an even hundred pages which serve their introductory purpose admirably. Since this is clearly their purpose, and the "history" begins with 1919, certain criticisms to which they are open need not be taken too seriously. As usual, Colbert's measures are made to seem more original than they were. "Mercantilism" is rendered artificial by the omission of feudal vestiges, and the consistent importance of the French home market is under-emphasized—this applies to the whole book.

After 1918 France was left exposed to economic as well as political dangers by the anxiety of her Anglo-Saxon allies to resume their prewar policies as quickly as possible. The idealism concerning economic barriers

expressed in the third of Wilson's Fourteen Points "received only nebulous and perfunctory expression in the Covenant of the League; and the Treaty of Versailles . . . provided only for a measure of discrimination against the late enemy" (pp. 99-100).

Currency disorders, promoted among other things by refusal to face the problem of transferring reparation and debt payments, made stable tariffs by negotiation impossible. France's specific customs duties were particularly undermined by inflation. She tried to get away from most-favored-nation clauses and from long-term conventions which deprived her of tariff autonomy but gave up in 1927. The Franco-German Convention of that year, followed by others and by stabilization of the franc, came too near the crisis of 1929 to have its expected results, but it was probably "the greatest single contribution to liberal trading policies and to the cause of international co-operation in the twenty-five years since 1914" (p. 138).

Book III (pp. 141-215) is a compact but moving and intelligible account of policies from the crisis of 1931 to the outbreak of war in 1939. It deals with import prohibitions, state controls of transactions, and the rise of publicly planned monopoly within protectionist walls. Each "temporary" makeshift helped to fasten previous ones and called for others, until a quite unwanted system emerged in place of that which the measures had sought to protect or restore. As elsewhere in the book, the tone is explanatory and noncontroversial, actions taken being framed in the reasons and circumstances. The narrative is lucid and powerful without any dramatizing of the wording itself. I think that nonspecialists will get a clear picture of a veritable economic revolution which occurred in an extremely short period and that specialists will also find the book well worth reading.

Book IV deals very briefly with colonial trade policies as they bear upon the general French problem. There is little discussion of capital movements anywhere in the study. This is most regrettable in these closing chapters, since the movements were so largely French and so intimately linked to the commodity trade.

*University of California.*

M. M. KNIGHT.

*Balkan Union: A Road to Peace in Southeastern Europe.* By THEODORE I. GESHKOFF. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. xvi, 345. \$3.00.)

THIS new study of the Balkan Entente has great merits. It succeeds in treating the problem of Balkan confederation against a broad historical background. While the story of the ancient Greek confederacies probably had more meaning for the makers of the American Constitution than it has for Balkan politicians of today, the realistic account of successive nineteenth century proposals for Balkan union forms a significant prelude to a detailed account of the Balkan movement of the 1930's. Dr. Geshkoff describes with skill and discernment the various steps which led from the first

Balkan Conference, in 1930, to the signing of the Balkan Pact in 1934, letting the voluminous documentary materials speak for themselves in due moderation. Sixty-four pages of appendixes enable the more zealous of his readers to examine for themselves some of the salient documents of the movement for Balkan co-operation.

This careful study, which will be of permanent value as a record of one of the more hopeful developments of the disastrous 1930's, suffers, like other accounts of the Balkan Conferences and Balkan Entente, from the lack of a European perspective. While the author has attempted in a few hasty pages (226-30) to continue his narrative down to the end of 1939, he has little to say of the Balkan movement after the signing of the pact in February, 1934, or of its relation to the main currents of European policy. The Balkan Entente, in its political form of 1934, represented chiefly a limited reinsurance of their intra-Balkan frontiers by the four satisfied nations of that area. It was born of the uneasiness aroused by the menace of German and Italian aggression, but, paradoxically, its point was directed solely against Bulgaria, from which no real danger threatened. The gesture of February 9, 1934, now appears in a truer perspective as historically more dramatic, but politically no more significant, than numerous similar gestures of good will made during the same decade by the Baltic, Scandinavian, Little, and Saadabad Ententes.

In one respect the author displays an evident bias. His denunciations are regularly reserved for Bulgarian policies, except in the time of Stambuliski's government. Yet his single quotation from Stambuliski's program (pp. 61-62), instead of clinching his argument, shows that except for its republican tendency Stambuliski's program of Balkan union did not differ essentially from that of the Bulgarian governments in the 1930's. A kind of "patriotism in reverse" leads the author to see "militarists" (p. 82) and "despots" (p. 203) only in Bulgaria. However shortsighted some of Ferdinand's policies were, there is no proof that he wanted in 1912 and 1913 to reduce Serbia and Greece to the position of vassals (p. 43). While the Bulgarian decision to begin the Second Balkan War was foolhardy, it was preceded by an abundance of Serb and Greek provocation in Macedonia (p. 45). It can hardly be claimed that Bulgaria's surrender in 1918 shortened the World War by one or two years (p. 54). While the overthrow of the Macedonian Organization was a chief purpose of the 1934 *coup d'état*, it was by no means the sole one (p. 222). To cap it all, Bulgaria is the only country mentioned by name as a violator of the Argentine Anti-War Treaty (p. 224)! Finally, it is difficult to accept literally the author's rhetorical argument that the republican form of government is as well suited to Balkan peoples as to the people of the United States or of Switzerland (pp. 124-25).

Cornell University.

PHILIP E. MOSELY.

*Food Production in Western Europe: An Economic Survey of Agriculture in Six Countries.* By P. LAMARTINE YATES. Being the Report of an Inquiry organized by Viscount Astor and B. Seeböhm Rowntree. Foreword by Sir William Beveridge. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1940. Pp. xv, 572. \$6.00.)

IN order to determine how far the agricultural development in countries in western Europe has been "beneficial to the public welfare as a whole", and, in particular, whether it has or has not been "advantageous to them to retain in farming a much larger proportion of their population than Britain" (p. 3), Mr. Yates analyzes in great detail the whole agricultural setup of six countries (Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Switzerland, and Germany). All data are presented in comparison with those of Great Britain, and this raises the number of countries investigated to seven.

The book makes very good reading. The amount of information is inspiring. Traces of haste, it is true, are noticed at once. If the author had not been pressed for time, he would hardly have used averages for France as a whole in his analysis. The regional variations in crops, yields, and farm sizes (to mention but a few examples) in that country are too great for average figures to be representative. For comparison with the situation in Great Britain, only the situation of northern France is useful. Southern France belongs to another agricultural world.

Inexact statements are too numerous for an enumeration of even the more important ones. The major objection of the reviewer is to the method of analyzing prices, incomes, and wages used throughout the book. To appraise the level of prices of farm products and farm land or the level of farm income and wages of farm labor in a given country, they have to be analyzed within the general situation of that particular country. The level of farm prices, for example, can be correctly appraised only by comparing it with the cost of the principal production factors. Mr. Yates knows this and makes use of this procedure, but only occasionally—to elaborate on conclusions arrived at by the principal procedure used by him throughout the study—and merely in the form of discussion without presenting the actual figures.

The principal procedure consists in comparing the prices, incomes, and wages in the six countries with those in Great Britain, all foreign data being converted into English currency and expressed in percentages of the respective English data. This method does not provide entirely satisfactory results, even for periods in which the exchange rates had remained unchanged for a longer time. But Mr. Yates's principal conclusions are based on comparisons of data for the years 1936 to 1938, in which exchange rates were by no means stabilized or at truly comparable purchasing power parities.

Conclusions based on French prices, incomes, and wages, converted to English units by using the rates of exchange current in 1936 and 1937, seem rather problematical to the reviewer. The exchange rates of the French

franc were 74.27 to the English pound in 1935, 83.00 in 1936, and 124.40 in 1937. Domestic prices, especially wages and land prices, tend to lag considerably behind the rate of exchange.

Mr. Yates's conclusions as to Germany have suffered even more because of this procedure. As in the case of the other investigated countries, his basic data were German prices, incomes, and wages for three periods (1911-13, 1927-29, and 1936-38), converted into English money and expressed in percentages of the respective English data. His conclusions have been based mainly on the thus converted German prices from 1936 through 1938, for which the conversion was made by the use of the arbitrary rate of 20 German marks to the English pound. Many conclusions would have been quite different if in his analysis the author had paid more attention to his own data for the two earlier periods.

For decades Germany was a country of high protection for, and high prices of, its principal grains (rye, oats, and wheat). In recent years all grains were highly protected and highly priced. There is hardly another of the larger countries with a price relation between commercial fertilizer and grain so favorable for the latter as Germany. It may be conservatively estimated that one kilogram each of N,  $P_2O_5$ , and  $K_2O$  applied to sterile soil produce 15 to 20 kilograms of rye or even more. In the spring of 1938 the indicated amounts of fertilizer delivered to the German farmers cost 0.75 to 0.80 German marks, but the farmers were guaranteed 2.86 to 3.82 marks for the rye produced from these quantities of fertilizer. Yet Mr. Yates comes to the conclusion that "German [cereal] prices are remarkably low".

Students, especially those who do not know German and French, cannot afford to neglect this book, for much valuable information is brought together in convenient form in one place. But a considerable amount of caution seems advisable, especially with reference to the author's discussion of Germany.

*United States Department of Agriculture.*

N. JASNY.

*The Irish Free State and its Senate: A Study in Contemporary Politics.* By

DONAL O'SULLIVAN. (London: Faber and Faber. 1940. Pp. xxxi, 666. 25s.)

DONAL O'Sullivan, author of this "study in contemporary politics", was clerk of the Irish Free State senate during the whole of its existence—from December 6, 1922, to May 29, 1936. When both the original senate and the Free State were brought to an end, he determined, he tells us, "to compile a record in which the history of the State itself should be combined, to serve as a chronicle of the past, and also, it may be, as a guide for the future".

The result is a volume which admirably meets the first of its declared purposes and has the merit of liveliness and general good humor, at least, in its efforts to accomplish the second. Mr. O'Sullivan tells us very honestly that he has thought it neither necessary nor desirable wholly to suppress his personal opinions, and these, he adds, "are, indeed, strongly held". His view

that the reader can judge for himself whether or not they are sustained by the evidence is justified by the fullness of the record and by the excellent documentation from both senate and dail debates. As indicated, the volume is concerned almost exclusively with politics and pays but slight attention to social and economic facts and developinents.

Fortunately, too, Mr. O'Sullivan has carried the story beyond the demise of the original senate in May, 1936, and has given us, again with good documentation, three additional "current history" chapters which bring the story down to the outbreak of war in Europe in September, 1939. There are also several chapters on "Special Subjects", including material on the initiation of legislation, delegated legislation, money bills, and formalities and machinery of parliament.

The more recent historical account, chronologically arranged, deals with the abdication of King Edward VIII; the related External Relations Act; the new constitution (1937); the 1938 agreements with Great Britain ending the trade war, settling the land annuities issue and other financial disputes, and returning the treaty ports; the report of the Commission on Banking, Currency, and Credit (1938); and the declaration of neutrality in the European war.

Mr. O'Sullivan concludes:

On the 3rd. September [1939] war was declared on Germany by Great Britain and France, and the British declaration, of course, involved Northern Ireland in belligerency. The remaining member-states of the Commonwealth—Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Canada—in the exercise of their constitutional right as free nations, successively ranged themselves on the side of Great Britain. And so began a conflict from the results of which Ireland cannot remain immune, and of which as yet no man can see the end.

One may, perhaps, usefully conclude by reporting that Mr. O'Sullivan has performed the service of indicating intelligibly the pronunciation of Eire. "It is so often mispronounced", he tells us, "that it is well to mention that it rhymes, approximately, with 'Sarah'."

*Washington, D. C.*

WILBUR LAURENT WILLIAMS.

#### AMERICAN HISTORY

*The Triumph of American Capitalism: The Development of Forces in American History to the End of the Nineteenth Century.* By LOUIS M. HACKER. (New York: Simon and Schuster. 1940. Pp. x, 460. \$3.00.)

THIS unusual book is an attempt to fit our political and economic history into an institutional framework. Capitalism, according to Professor Hacker, is "an economic order based on the profit motive: therefore its leading characteristics are the private ownership of the means of production, their operation for pecuniary gain, their control by private enterprisers, and the

use of credit and the wage system" (p. 16). Modern Europe and the United States have passed through a number of stages of capitalism. The first one was mercantile capitalism, whose hallmark is "the association of the enterpriser with trade and banking". Its development was responsible for the American Revolution, a struggle "not over high sounding political and constitutional concepts . . . [but] over colonial manufacturing, wild lands and furs, sugar, wine, tea and currency, all of which meant simply the survival or collapse of English mercantile capitalism within the imperial-colonial framework of the mercantilist system" (p. 161). During the succeeding half century and more American merchant capitalists prospered, speculated heavily, and then gave way to a new class of industrial capitalists. These, "associated largely with the ownership and management of factories", had risen from the ranks of labor. But by the late 1850's it became apparent that industrial capitalism "was incapable of achieving full maturity unless it had control of the State" (p. 200), which was still in the hands of Southern planters who "opposed protection", "frowned on internal improvements", "fought the federal chartering of a Pacific railway system", "favored state banking and cheap money", etc. (p. 251). The successful struggle to expand the power of the new capitalism was carried on in Congress largely by the Radical Republican element, which contained two factions, one interested in the black man's welfare and the other in the industrialist's. Lincoln "was not consciously aware of the significance of the whole economic program of industrial capitalism" (p. 339). Toward the end of the nineteenth century the finance capitalist or banker capitalist gradually took control from the industrial capitalist, established huge monopolies, widened foreign markets by developing backward regions, and called upon the state to protect such investments. Imperialism meant strengthening the government and paved the way for the next stage, state capitalism, which we are now entering.

About a sixth of the book is devoted to "European Antecedents", a quarter to "The Victory of Mercantile Capitalism in the Revolution", and a half to "The Victory of American Capitalism and the Civil War". At this point, where many writers would begin, Professor Hacker sketches the bare outlines of finance and state capitalism and writes his conclusion, "Was American Capitalism a Success?" Why stop here? Perhaps the answer is that this is the portion of capitalism's development that he most nearly approves. He says: "The capitalism that I have described gave us the physical means of achieving abundance; and . . . even a richer heritage: for it wove the idea of egalitarianism into the warp and woof of our tradition." But he indicates that finance capitalism brought a decline of the tradition of equal opportunity (p. 15). Will there follow another volume more severe in tone?

Historians will take issue with Professor Hacker on numerous points. Some colonial historians will consider the importance of mercantilism as a cause of the Revolution exaggerated. This reviewer recently made a thorough



study of uncommercial colonial New Jersey and concluded that the causes of revolt there were to a large extent political in nature. The statement that "Manufacturing did not appear in America because the very nature of the colonial system prohibited it" (p. 139) is misleading. Some manufacturing did appear, but little was to be expected in a virgin territory where the extractive industries would be more easily worked and more profitable. New Englanders will find the moral crusade against slavery as a cause of the Civil War underemphasized. Southern historians will raise an eyebrow at the statement that the Reconstruction governments, "considering the inexperience and lack of leadership of the great mass, worked well" (p. 379). Many will wonder how the New Deal administration can be said to "herald" abundance (p. 435) in the light of its agricultural program, its general price-raising policy, and its discouragement of capital accumulation. The thoughtful historian will discount what seem to be repeated hints of a conscious long-range program on the part of capitalists. I doubt if any cabal planned it that way. But that is not to deny the existence of numerous schemes by individuals and groups for self-enrichment or to overlook the pattern of events that stands out because so many persons were behaving similarly. Let no historian, however, undertake lightly to dispute Professor Hacker, for his material is beautifully organized, he is a keen analyst, and he is usually careful to marshal a host of supporting facts on questionable points and to quote historians untainted by any suspicion of Marxism.

*University of Illinois.*

DONALD L. KEMMERER.

*Studies of the Virginia Eastern Shore in the Seventeenth Century.* By SUSIE M. AMES. (Richmond: Dietz Press. 1940. Pp. 274. \$3.50.)

THIS book is a storehouse of valuable facts dug from county court records which reach back in unbroken sequence to 1632, although those used date chiefly from 1657. The counties are Northampton, first named Accawmack, one of the eight original Virginia shires created in 1634, and Accomac, carved from Northampton around 1662. Extending about seventy-five miles, with a mean width, exclusive of the marsh and island fringe, of about eight miles in Accomac and about six miles in Northampton, they comprise the Delaware-Maryland-Virginia peninsula known as the Eastern Shore. Chesapeake Bay separates the peninsula from the rest of Virginia. The eight chapters constituting the book deal with the geographical and political background of these counties, their system of land tenure, products and markets, early industries, legal institutions, law enforcement, and with the Church of England and early dissent within their bounds.

The author's conclusions do not differ materially from those hitherto presented, except that the records "afford but scant support" to the "current views" that "the landholdings were small throughout the seventeenth century, that tenantry was of very limited extent, and that the first negroes



brought in had the status of indentured servants" (preface). Thus, contrary to Professor Thomas J. Wertenbaker, she finds "more than a few instances" of grants which exceeded 1,000 acres; also that the moderate grant increased in size during 1650-75 and that the average plantation was then about 900 acres (p. 26). But during 1680-1700 large estates broke up; in 1703-1704 the average plantation in Northampton had dropped to 389 acres, in Accomac to 520 acres. Nevertheless, in Northampton twenty-one persons, 3 per cent of the total number of tithables, held 39 per cent of the land; in Accomac forty-six persons, 4 per cent of the total number of tithables, held 43 per cent of the land (pp. 30-31). Regarding tenantry the author can give no estimate of the proportion of tenant population, but "planter-merchants dominated"; these scattered acreages "were operated usually by tenants", tradesmen as well as farmers (pp. 38, 245). Rented tracts varied from 10 to 3,000 acres (p. 39). The author states that Professor Wertenbaker and the late P. A. Bruce found leases uncommon but gave no seventeenth century evidence (p. 37). She does not succeed in establishing the status of the Negro before 1655 (pp. 101 ff.) and gives no clear picture of the economy of the region. Her statements regarding it are contradictory (pp. 45, 51-52, 61). To what extent grain and livestock and to what extent tobacco "with the resulting commercial activity was the main source of economic well-being" is not revealed since the evolution of these industries is not described. While recognizing the limits of time and space, one cannot help thinking that some of the material might have been co-ordinated and research carried deeper, especially in the chapters on "Early Industries", "Products and Markets", and "Tenure of Land". A case in point is the cattle industry. The monopoly of most of the islands "by a few stock raisers" (p. 35) suggests a herding business, significant for that day, in contradistinction to the ownership of cattle loose in the forests. The facts in chapters I, III, and IV are not co-ordinated. A check on the Turner theory would be specially valuable, since herding seems to be missing in the valley of the James, probably because of severe winters, hostile Indians, and lack of markets.

Although the preface announces the purpose "to illustrate certain aspects of colonial life in Virginia", may not the Eastern Shore be atypical? With no open door to the West, it was in a way a blind alley. This may explain its tenantry. It was unique in its isolation, freedom from hostile Indians, and in retaining more forests; and unusual in its special incentives to maritime activity, herding, and manufacturing, aversion by 1715 to paying public dues in tobacco, and in its soils. In 1880-1910, its lands advanced 300 to 450 per cent. Since then it has been in the top land value group of Virginia agricultural counties. Its staple crop is the potato, not tobacco. What was the place of this sandy loam area in the British colonial system? Although one may not always approve Dr. Ames's manner of handling her material, her book is a distinct addition to the serious study of Virginia.

*Historical Records Survey, Richmond, Virginia.* KATHLEEN BRUCE.

*Torchbearer of the Revolution: The Story of Bacon's Rebellion and its Leader.* By THOMAS JEFFERSON WERTENBAKER. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940. Pp. vi, 237. \$2.50.)

PROFESSOR Wertenbaker has returned to seventeenth century Virginia to present in a scholarly and dramatic way a complete case history of a popular revolution against an oppressive autocratic government.

The background of the rebellion is graphically set forth. The reviewer, however, does not share the publisher's great satisfaction (as expressed on the jacket of the book) over the novel method used in the first chapter of introducing a fictitious character, one Peter Bottom, to make the narrative more vivid. The device, however, is used cautiously, and no harm has resulted.

Rebellions have a way of bringing upon the stage men of remarkable force and personality. That of 1676 in Virginia proved no exception to the rule. The twenty-nine-year-old aristocrat, Nathaniel Bacon, was a master of arts of Cambridge, widely traveled on the Continent, and trained in law at Gray's Inn. He was a born leader of men—magnetic in personality, eloquent, intelligent, daring, and devoid of personal ambition.

Professor Wertenbaker states that he has written this book "in the hope that at last justice would be done to the memory of this remarkable man", "the greatest figure of the first century of American history", "a patriot, a champion of the weak, a rebel against injustice, the forerunner of Washington, Jefferson and Samuel Adams". Much new material regarding Bacon's early life and the reasons for his coming to Virginia, only hinted at in the official records of the time, is given here.

The whole complicated story of the rebellion itself is well told—campaigns against the Indians, civil strife, and even the influence of sea power as one of the deciding factors in the collapse of the rebellion several months after Bacon's death. In the meanwhile the tyrannical and revengeful old governor, Berkeley, had begun "a series of trials and executions unparalleled in all American history for brutality and vindictiveness".

Dr. Wertenbaker contends that Bacon and his followers were patriots like Henry, Washington, and Jefferson, of a century later, and not rebels and traitors, and that although they were crushed and treated as rebels, they did not suffer in vain.

"Bacon's Rebellion" was not without its lasting influence upon American history. It put an end to the Berkeleian system of government by corruption, for there were no more long Assemblies in the colony; it brought about reform in local government since many of Bacon's laws were reenacted in later sessions; it fortified the people to resist the assault on their liberty known as the second Stuart despotism; it gave the English Privy Council a realization of what was to be expected when the Americans were driven to desperation. But after all, the movement was symptomatic rather than conclusive. . . . Bacon's Declaration of the People was the forerunner of the Declaration of Independence (p. 211).

A concluding chapter dealing with Virginia's struggle after 1676 against the second Stuart despotism would have been a welcome feature of the book; but the story of this "critical period" may be found in Professor Wertenbaker's *Virginia under the Stuarts*.

The few errors noted seem too trivial to mention. The interested scholar will be grieved in finding no direct citations to authorities. The reviewer, from his acquaintance with Dr. Wertenbaker's other works, suspects that the publisher was responsible for this omission, under a misguided belief that footnotes would detract from the popular appeal of the work. A few pictures would have been generally welcomed. On the other hand, Dr. Wertenbaker has added in conclusion a full and discriminating critical "Essay on Authorities"; the format of the book is pleasing in every way; and the author has achieved his purpose in a scholarly and exceedingly interesting fashion.

*College of William and Mary.*

RICHARD L. MORTON.

*The Background of the Revolution in Maryland.* By CHARLES ALBRO BARKER, Assistant Professor of History in Stanford University. [Yale Historical Publications, Leonard Woods Labaree, Editor.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1940. Pp. x, 419. \$3.50.)

THE subject of this book invites comparison with Mereness's *Maryland as a Proprietary Province*, which covers much of the same ground but with a different approach. Both studies show competent use of printed and manuscript sources; but Professor Barker's work was simplified by the printing, notably in later volumes of the *Maryland Archives*, of much material which Dr. Mereness had to work through in manuscript. On the other hand, the present volume has profited, on the economic side especially, by the use of such additional unpublished sources as the Galloway Papers in the Library of Congress and important mercantile correspondence preserved, curiously enough, in a diocesan library.

Provincial administration receives less detailed examination in the present monograph; and while Mereness gave much of his space to the seventeenth century, Barker has concentrated attention on the last half century of the proprietary regime. Within this period he presents a fresh and interesting treatment of the later Baltimore proprietors as absentee landlords, exploiting their governmental prerogatives for their own profit and that of their "court" circle. One conspicuous example of this was their close control of ecclesiastical patronage with slight regard to pastoral qualifications. Of course, a landlord seeking maximum returns from his estate needed efficient agents to safeguard and, if possible, increase those returns, of which the quitrents—more successfully administered here than elsewhere—formed the most important single item. In this respect the later Calverts, though inferior in character and ability to the seventeenth century founders, achieved considerable success. The resident governorship was, on the whole, in com-

petent hands during this period, though the proprietors as dispensers of lucrative patronage frequently embarrassed the holders of that office by entrusting other posts to unworthy favorites. In any case, the financial demands of the proprietor and his parasitic associates took from the Maryland people a tribute quite out of proportion to the social services of the provincial government. Resentment of such exploitation fed the antiproprietary movements, which met, however, with only limited success. The assembly's plan to enlist the interest of the imperial government by the establishment of an independent colonial agency in London was defeated; and an opinion by Attorney General Pratt, afterwards more favorably known to Americans as Lord Camden, definitely sustained the claims of the proprietor as against those of the assembly. So it came about that opposition to the proprietors was finally merged with the intercolonial revolt against imperial policies, becoming, in the author's opinion, a major factor, so far as Maryland was concerned, in the revolutionary movement.

Professor Barker believes that the acts of trade contributed little directly to the growth of revolutionary sentiment, though here, as in Virginia, friction between tobacco producers and British merchants arose, not wholly but in part, from the commercial system. Certainly the planters were convinced that too large a part of their production was absorbed by British middlemen, as well as by governmental charges, before their tobacco reached the ultimate consumer abroad. In spite of the passage of inspection laws to raise the standard of Maryland exports and some interesting negotiations with British merchants, this marketing problem remained substantially unsolved. For the province as a whole, however, the situation was partially relieved by the gradual increase of "nonstaple" exports to other colonies, continental and insular, and the development of the iron industry. Imperial relations were complicated by the later intercolonial wars with their call for provincial co-operation, a co-operation which in the case of Maryland was grudgingly given or withheld altogether, partly because the assembly used this opportunity to press the proprietor for concessions which he was unwilling to grant. By way of comparison, something might have been added here about the situation across the border in Pennsylvania.

In his interesting survey of social conditions and culture under the old regime the author notes the bearing of prerevolutionary liberalism, in politics and religion, on later developments; and in his closing chapter he suggests that the leadership of the colonial gentry, increasingly marked during this period by appeals for broader popular support, favored a cautious, or Whiggish, type of liberalism in the process of reconstruction after independence was declared.

References to contemporary British theory and practice seem in the main well taken but in certain instances questionable. In the light of recent studies it is quite safe to say that under the early Hanoverian kings "the exercise of the crown prerogative in British domestic affairs" was "archaic" (p. 214)?

Again, is it a peculiarly "Lockean assumption" (p. 225) that financial demands upon the subject should have the assent of the people or their representatives?

Columbia University.

EVARTS B. GREENE.

*The Articles of Confederation: An Interpretation of the Social-Constitutional History of the American Revolution, 1774-1781.* By MERRILL JENSEN. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1940. Pp. vi, 284. \$3.00.)

Two fifths of approximately 245 pages of text in this book are introductory, culminating in the presentation to the Continental Congress of the resolution for independence and the preparation of a plan of confederation. The purpose of this carefully prepared explanatory matter is to show the "internal revolution" that was taking place "in the American states: the individual and group interests, the social cleavages, and the interstate conflicts that existed at the outbreak of the Revolution".

Then follows an account of the progress of the Articles of Confederation through Congress, the completion of the plan, the ratification by the several states except Maryland, and a careful consideration of the reasons for that state's delay. When Maryland had accomplished her purpose and her delegates in Congress were empowered to ratify, the Confederation was formally completed on March 1, 1781.

The author has read widely and understandingly "the obvious sources for eighteenth-century American history". He has revolted, as many another student before him has rebelled, against the generally accepted historical treatment of the Confederation. He accordingly presents his own interpretation. This he has done clearly and simply—a little too simply, for there were many personal and complicating forces at work, even more than he recognizes. He analyzes the issue between "radicals" and "conservatives", who are, however, better referred to as "classes" or "interests" than as "parties", and he shows the essential self-interest of both states and individuals in the formulation and ratification of the Articles of Confederation.

pt. The ownership of the Western lands was the all-important feature of the situation, together with the selfish advantages sought that consciously and unconsciously controlled attitudes and actions. The author is apparently shocked to find so many of the leading personages involved in land speculation—the get-rich-quick method of that period—and shows a slight bias (characteristic of the present proletarian trend) in favor of the radicals, perhaps because hitherto the conservatives have been given most of the credit. The reviewer wonders if the author has appreciated that some of those great and justly honored men were using trust funds as well as their own private resources in land speculation. Such carelessness is the height of malfeasance in our day but quite in accord with the best standards of the eighteenth century.

The book ends—as all such books should end—with a brief chapter of “Conclusions” giving the author’s epitome of the results of his studies.

It is to be hoped that the promise implied in the preface will be fulfilled and that this work is only “introductory to an extended history of the period from the ratification of the Articles to the ratification of the Constitution of 1787”. If the author does carry out such an intention, he will find that the work he has already done is child’s play in comparison with the difficulties to be encountered in the years after 1781. [Considerations largely omitted in the earlier study—trade, commerce, currency, and finance—then become the controlling elements. Data for these have not yet been compiled and in many instances are not available.]

It is a pleasure to handle a book the manufacture of which is of such high quality as to printing, paper, and binding and in which the references are so conveniently arranged and measure up to the best of scholarly standards.

*Huntington Library.*

MAX FARRAND.

*The Loyalists in North Carolina during the Revolution.* By ROBERT O. DEMOND, Professor of History, State Teachers College, Buffalo, New York. [Duke University Publications.] (Durham: Duke University Press. 1940. Pp. viii, 286. \$3.00.)

Few events in American history are more confused and difficult to understand than the Revolution in North Carolina. In that colony the taxation policy of parliament had little to do with the revolt; the revolutionary impulse came from other causes and was curiously mixed.

For years before the Revolution the people in the North Carolina back country were thoroughly dissatisfied with the colonial government. The chief trouble in North Carolina, as in Virginia, was fiscal; specie drained out of the colonies, which were obliged to depend on a paper currency that depreciated. The currency question may indeed be called the determining factor in the Revolution in the Southern colonies. Moreover, North Carolinians were dissatisfied with their court system and bitterly resentful of the taxes levied by the provincial assembly; the new settlers, just developing their lands, felt that the burden of government was intolerable.

This discontent found vent in an insurrection against the colonial authorities; the rebels were known as Regulators. The movement became so widespread that Governor Tryon raised an army to suppress it; this was accomplished at the battle of the Alamance, 1771, sometimes mistakenly termed the first battle of the Revolution.

The author gives a full account of this insurrection. The Regulators were quite as much opposed to the provincial assembly as they were to the royal governor. It followed, then, that they went over to the royal side in the Revolution when Governor Martin, Tryon’s successor, treated them with

great leniency. The people who had manned Tryon's army took the patriot side in the Revolution, a strange reversal.

It appears that an actual majority of the North Carolina people sympathized with the royal cause. The loyalists were suppressed only with difficulty and by means of severe measures. Many were imprisoned, many transported to other parts of the state, many executed; a horrible civil war developed in North Carolina as a result of this persecution that lasted even after the treaty of peace in 1783 had officially ended the war. Outrages were freely committed on both sides, though more numerous on that of the patriots. The Scots, particularly the Highlanders, were generally Tory and suffered indescribable miseries for their loyalty to Britain. Many of them were forced to leave the state at the end of the war.

The book is a well-written and careful study based on the original sources; the research seems to be very complete. The subject is so difficult to treat because of the conflicting currents that the reader is sometimes left in doubt as to the actual meaning of events. A little more interpretation would be helpful in places; it is at times difficult to make a judgment from the narrative. All in all, however, the monograph is a fine piece of historical research and a credit to the Duke University Press, which is bringing out some good books.

Richmond, Virginia.

H. J. ECKENRODE.

*Mr. Samuel McIntire, Carver, the Architect of Salem.* By FISKE KIMBALL, Director of the Philadelphia Museum of Art. (Portland: Southworth-Anthoensen Press for the Essex Institute of Salem, Massachusetts. 1940. Pp. xiii, 157. Fig. 373. \$12.00.)

NATIONAL power and maturity and the impact of world events have combined to foster in Americans a consciousness and curiosity concerning their native culture. At such a time a book about Samuel McIntire, one of the most significant architects of our early history, has special interest.

McIntire merits attention as a great artist and typical American, whose work was definitely native in character. The son of a line of housewrights, he learned his trade with his father, primarily as a wood carver, and gradually developed his ability for architectural design. He examined the current handbooks, studied the work of his contemporaries, both English and American, and followed the fashion of the day, but in his work he adapted the models that inspired him to his own needs and taste. He was born in 1757 and died in 1811. During this period Salem became a great port and acquired the political and economic importance that provided the basis for prolific building and consequent architectural development. McIntire's work was of the widest variety: houses for wealthy merchants and modest farmers; churches, public buildings, and mastheads and general carpentry for ships; he submitted a highly commendable design for the Capitol in Wash-



ington and at the same time did not disdain to repair wagons and sleighs; and he executed most of the finely detailed woodwork in the houses that he designed. Through all these works Samuel McIntire left the stamp of his genius upon his native town. In later years, when new styles evolved, Salem had lost its maritime importance and had ceased to develop. Consequently, the architecture remains today essentially as McIntire left it, and we are able to estimate and admire the skill, originality, and taste of this modest housewright, who produced some of the finest examples of American architecture.

Fiske Kimball has presented a valuable book, carefully documented and beautifully edited. The illustrations are complete and well presented. The inclusion of several prototypes (drawings from "handbooks" and "builders' guides" which served as derivatives), together with McIntire's interpretation of these models, is especially informative. The book will be interesting to students and amateurs of Americana.

*Columbia University School of Architecture.*      LEOPOLD ARNAUD.

*Sailor of Fortune: The Life and Adventures of Commodore Barney, U.S.N.*

By HULBERT FOOTNER. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1940. Pp. 323. \$3.00.)

Mr. Footner prefaces his book with this statement: "In this my first extended work of history, I had everything to learn about research and the arrangement of material." We can only say that he has proved himself to be a remarkably apt student, for he has turned out a most competent historical study and has told the story of his hero in a manner which leaves the reader interested to the last page.

Joshua Barney lived in America at a time that called for bold, hardy, resolute men, and he was admirably suited to his times. At thirteen he had gone to sea; at fifteen, by an odd chance, he had commanded a ship in a voyage across the Atlantic; and at sixteen, at an age when modern boys are still in high school, he had become an officer in the Continental navy. Three times during the Revolution he was a prisoner-of-war, once on the infamous prison-ship *Good Hope* in New York harbor and again in the notorious Mill Prison at Plymouth, England. From this prison he made a spectacular escape. But he survived these hardships to win one of the most notable sea fights in American naval annals when he captured the famous British raider, *General Monk*, with the Pennsylvania state ship, *Hyder-Ally*. This engagement was fought on April 8, 1782, when Barney was not yet twenty-three years old. At one time he held a commission in the French navy. In the course of an adventurous business career after the Revolution he won and lost several fortunes. In the War of 1812 he climaxed his career by offering a desperate resistance to the British at Bladensburg when they marched on Washington and burned the capital.



Mr. Footner has rendered a real service to American history by rescuing from oblivion such a notable American seaman and naval hero. In compiling his material he has drawn on the manuscript sources of the Navy Department, the Library of Congress, the National Archives, and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, as well as on contemporary newspapers and diaries. This reviewer believes the book to be one of the outstanding works on American history published in 1940. The sketch of the *Alfred*, the flagship of the first squadron of the Continental navy, which was found in an old account book and is reproduced in this volume, is the only contemporary drawing of this famous vessel which the reviewer has seen.

*United States Naval Academy.*

LOUIS H. BOLANDER.

*Edward Livingston: Jeffersonian Republican and Jacksonian Democrat.* By WILLIAM B. HATCHER. [Southern Biography Series, edited by Wendell Holmes Stephenson and Fred C. Cole.] (University: Louisiana State University Press. 1940. Pp. xiv, 518. \$3.50.)

THE need for a life of Edward Livingston does not have to be argued. The only full-length portrait of the man was done in 1864 without benefit of critical scholarship. Although it was based on substantial manuscript materials, there are many errors which went uncorrected until the appearance of the brief sketch in the *Dictionary of American Biography*. It is therefore gratifying to find a biography of Edward Livingston comparable in scholarship and objectivity with other volumes which have recently dealt with early nineteenth century statesmen.

Mr. Hatcher correctly portrays the elements of strength and weakness in Livingston. He was a man of sound education with a linguistic equipment unusual for an American of his day. At the same time he had an almost pettifogging propensity for constitutional construction and was wholly unable to manage his financial affairs. His admiration for France antedated the alliance of 1778 and was based upon a wide acquaintance with French literature, while his hatred of Great Britain dated from the burning of his home by the British forces in the Revolutionary War. Early experiences played an important role in shaping his later life.

If Livingston achieved prominence in American politics because of his friendship with Andrew Jackson, his reputation abroad rested upon his codification of the law in Louisiana. He had given an exhibition of remarkable legal talents before President Jackson elevated him to the position of Secretary of State or sent him to be minister to the court of Louis Philippe. Indeed, the broad experience with politics in New York, at Washington, and in Louisiana enabled Livingston to discharge successfully the great responsibilities imposed upon him late in life. He was always in the process of learning, and each set of experiences contributed to the increase of his intellectual stature.

The chief weakness of Mr. Hatcher's book lies in the failure to recognize fully the extent to which Livingston's public services contributed to the development of his character. For example, the trite phrases in which Livingston's congressional career immediately after 1823 is described would lead one to regard him merely as the faithful representative of his constituents. It was precisely at this time that he was beginning to exhibit the best qualities of his statesmanship.

That is not to say that the author has not written a good book. One looks in vain, however, for that insight into public affairs which a biographer like the late Senator Beveridge bestowed upon his subjects. But there are few scholars in politics who are qualified to write political biographies. Such books are better written by scholars who are not politicians than by politicians who are not scholars. Mr. Hatcher has done a sound piece of scholarship, and his book is a credit to the series in which it appears.

*Princeton University.*

WILLIAM SEAL CARPENTER.

*Life and Work of Prince Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin.* By the Reverend PETER HENRY LEMCKE. Translated by the Reverend JOSEPH C. PLUMPE, Professor of Classical Languages at the Pontifical College Josephinum. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1940. Pp. xxi, 257. \$2.50.)

SOME historical personalities are important without being highly romantic, while others are romantic without being highly important. It is fortunate for the general reader of historical biography that some historical characters have been both important and romantic. In this last class was Prince Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, an individual much better known, particularly in America, as Father Gallitzin. Son of a Russian prince and a Prussian noblewoman but himself an American frontier Catholic priest, his story combines in an intriguing way the background of the old world of Europe and the development of a new society in America.

The place of Father Gallitzin in American history is twofold. His greatest role was in planting Roman Catholicism in central and western Pennsylvania. Hardly less important was his work and place in frontier settlement and development in the adopted home of his religious activities.

The main reliance of posterity for information about this remarkable man has long been the *Leben und Wirken des Prinzen Demetrius Augustin Gallitzin* by his fellow priest, Father Lemcke, published in Münster in 1861, only four copies of which, according to the present translator, are located in this country. Other primary materials on Father Gallitzin are somewhat scanty. Most of them are incorporated in an edition of the letters and diaries of his mother and in a collection of his own polemical treatises. Including these two items, only fifteen publications are cited by the translator as literature used by him. We are informed that what has become of a mass of documents taken to Europe by Father Lemcke has "remained a mystery

ever since". This 1940 translated edition of the *Life and Work of Prince . . . Gallitzin* has as frontispiece the remarkable engraving of the 1861 biography. The translator's foreword furnishes a necessary and valuable sketch of the career of Father Lemcke. This foreword is followed by a one-page bibliography and a translation of the title page of the original German edition of 1861. The remainder of the volume is confined to a literal translation of the German original and a five-page index.

Father Lemcke was hardly a systematic author and certainly not a gifted biographer. His treatise is a symposium of varied but related matters. The translator admits being tempted to reorganize the contents but asserts that his product is "a faithful translation", which "has not omitted a single sentence". Probably this was imperative, but the net result is to furnish the English reader with a jumble of information about Lemcke, Germany, Russia, Catholicism in Europe and America, pioneer life in Pennsylvania, and the personality and career of Father Gallitzin, whose education in Europe, visit to America, ordination to the priesthood, and parish work at Loretto, Pennsylvania, from 1799 until his death in 1840, are all touched upon. The result is a very definite impression of the man and his work, an impression which is uplifting as well as intriguing.

This volume is well printed, though not on the best of paper, and well bound. It is well worth its price. Historical scholars are indebted to the translator and to the publishers.

*University of Pittsburgh.*

ALFRED P. JAMES.

*Transactions of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Michigan, 1805-36.*

Edited by WILLIAM WIRT BLUME, Professor of Law and of Legal Research, University of Michigan. Six volumes. [University of Michigan Publications, Law.] (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1935-40. Pp. liv, 632; v, 515; xliii, 755; v, 621; liii, 610; v, 482. \$5.00 a volume, \$25.00 for the set.)

THE political secret whose solution defied the wit of the rulers of the Old British Empire—how to govern a dependency—was unlocked by our own revolutionary thinkers even before the status of political independence had been achieved. By the device of dedicating the Western lands to eventual statehood, to be accorded as soon as a temporary political dependency had been undergone, they made possible the westward expansion of the United States to the Pacific and the development of the American nation as we know it.

The new colonial system was first instituted in the region lying north of the Ohio River. Here the Northwest Territory was established in 1788, and from its area five states—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin—were subsequently carved. The territorial dependency of Michigan endured longest and was perhaps endured by the inhabitants with the least

degree of satisfaction, especially during its first dozen years of existence. At length, by a successful revolution they discarded it, and from the late summer of 1835 until January 26, 1837, the state government of Michigan was functioning outside the Federal Union. Meanwhile the remnant of territorial government was prolonged briefly in a curiously useless session of the territorial legislature at Green Bay and in the territorial supreme court at Detroit, whose last session was held on June 30, 1836.

The story of archival administration in America is sufficiently dismal, and the Michigan territorial records afford a convenient illustration of this generalization. About twenty-five years ago the reviewer journeyed to Michigan for the express purpose of examining the record of a certain murder trial conducted by the territorial supreme court in 1821. At the State Library in Lansing he was firmly informed by an attendant that the territorial court records no longer existed. Insistent upon confirmation of this surprising statement, he was finally escorted to an elderly judge of the state supreme court, who courteously, but no less positively, repeated the information already imparted; when or why the precious records had vanished no one knew; that they had done so seemed abundantly clear, and the reviewer returned to his distant home convinced that insofar as his present bit of research was concerned, he had come to the end of the trail; yet all the time the records he was seeking, covering the activities of the territorial court for three decades, lay hidden away in the vaults of the very court whose officials were denying the fact of their existence.

Eventually they were rediscovered and disinterred and a decade ago were entrusted to Professor Blume of the University of Michigan Law School for editing. The resultant achievement can only be characterized as monumental, to be viewed by most historical editors with feelings of sinful envy. Provided with every scholarly facility that could be desired and laboring eight years at the task, Professor Blume now places the fruit of his toil before the reader in six massive volumes totaling over 3,600 pages, beautifully printed by the University of Michigan Press.

The territorial supreme court of Michigan functioned for thirty-one years, from July, 1805, to the close of June, 1836. Until 1824 the territory was administered by the governor and judges, as prescribed in the Ordinance of 1787. Throughout almost the same period the dominant member of the court was Judge Woodward, surely as amazing a character as America has produced. The existing records of the court's proceedings are far from complete, nor have all of them remained in the custody of the state. In the task of editing as many as could be found, Professor Blume has grouped them in three subdivisions of two volumes each: the first covers the transactions of the court from 1805 to October, 1814, when the first journal of the court terminated; the second includes the transactions of the court from 1814 to 1824, when Michigan entered upon the second grade

of territorial government; the third covers the years from 1825 until the final dying gasp of the territorial organization, terminated by the creation of Wisconsin Territory in July, 1836.

Since these are legal records, much of their contents is primarily interesting to lawyers, and the editorial task necessarily involved many problems which only a legal scholar is fitted to determine. The reviewer is devoid of legal training and incompetent, therefore, to undertake any technical discussion of Professor Blume's performance. But nothing affecting the activities of mankind is alien to the historian, and these records mirror so much of the life of the generation which produced them that no future serious historian of the Old Northwest can conclude his study without consulting them.

The task of transforming a wilderness into a self-governing commonwealth is so great that in its performance many things, either committed or omitted, are properly subjects of criticism. One of the most perplexing questions affecting the residents of Michigan Territory was what laws were really binding upon them. To what extent were the laws of New and Old France, of the province of Upper Canada, of the Northwest Territory, of Indiana Territory, or, finally, the British parliamentary statutes and the English common law valid in Michigan? Because of the long continuance of its territorial status the judicial system in Michigan, as an eminent jurist long since observed, "naturally became in close analogy to that of the United States". Because, also, of the political and geographical evolution of the Old Northwest and the adjacent area lying farther westward, the Michigan court records possess great importance for students of the history of such states as Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and the Dakotas. Thus as recently as 1931 the Wisconsin supreme court "in a scholarly opinion as to the constitutionality of a Wisconsin statute giving to the Supreme Court of that State power to regulate Proceeding, Practice, and Procedure, in all the courts of Wisconsin, based its decision in large part upon a study of the history of the courts in Michigan Territory" (III, v).

Life in Michigan Territory was far from placid. Difficulties over land titles, the imposition of American law and American officials upon a community wholly alien in sentiment and chiefly so in blood and religion, the ever-present menace of savage hostility upon a thinly populated frontier, separated by a wide wilderness from the settled portions of the United States, the frequent occasions of discord with the officials of Upper Canada, the aspirations and quarrels of ambitious territorial officials, far removed from the watchful control of the appointive power and wholly free from any control by the citizens they were sent to govern—these were but a few of the factors which lent uncertainty, and hence interest, to the time. In view of all the circumstances it is not so surprising that the civil government sometimes functioned badly as that it succeeded in functioning at all.

The territory was supremely fortunate in its second governor, Lewis Cass, whose long and able rule lasted from 1813 to 1831; it was fortunate, likewise, in its court, as the records now published abundantly attest.

In recent years critics of the possessors of great American fortunes have been numerous and clamant. It is but proper to note, therefore, in conclusion, that to William W. Cook, the creator of one such fortune, is owing the editing and publication of these important records.

*Detroit Public Library.*

M. M. QUALIFE.

*Pennsylvania Politics, 1817-1832: A Game without Rules.* By PHILIP SHRIVER KLEIN. (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania. 1940. Pp. viii, 430. \$3.50.)

No state in the Union offers a richer field for the exploration of the intricacies of politics than does Pennsylvania, which, at almost any period in its history, is a veritable laboratory for such a study. Dr. Klein has elected to deal with the period from 1817 to 1832, during which the commonwealth was passing through a transition from an old to a new political order. His book is divided into two parts, the first of which describes the social, economic, and political life of the commonwealth in 1817, while the second gives the details of the political struggles of the fifteen succeeding years. Interwoven with the story of state politics is the discussion of local and national issues bearing on the subject. Having explored the field from every angle, Dr. Klein moves with sure tread through the mass of details, and one lays down his book with the feeling that here is a substantial, scholarly, and valuable study, which will remain a definitive treatment of the subject.

It has often been suggested that Pennsylvania has never played a part in national politics commensurate with her importance as a state, and various explanations have been offered for this from time to time. For the period under review Dr. Klein finds its causes in the factional fights of rival politicians, in the excessive sectionalism within the state, and in the personal prestige of President Jackson, which overshadowed the merits of every question of state advantage with which it came into conflict. He finds also that the aristocracy of birth and wealth in Pennsylvania was so occupied with commerce and finance that it did not enter politics to the extent that this class did elsewhere, particularly in the South. Thus politics was deprived of much of the best talent in the commonwealth, and the offices were filled mainly by the middle class of the population. Furthermore, the constitution of 1790 not only gave the governor large powers, especially of appointment, but made him eligible for three successive terms, which provisions proved to be a dividing influence, since his excessive powers invariably led to a movement to overthrow him before he became so strongly entrenched as to be invulnerable. Hardly had he taken his seat before he became a target for attacks from every quarter, not only from the opposition party but from

ambitious leaders within his own party as well. The result was that the governors emerged from office "so thoroughly besmirched with mud slung by antagonists or jealous partisans that they were useless for future political advancement". Thus the governorship, which in other states has often been a steppingstone to political preferment, in this state wrought the destruction of those who were elected to it. From 1790 to the present time no governor of Pennsylvania has ever entered the national cabinet, and only two of them, Finlay and Bigler, ever became United States senators.

In discussing racial factors in Pennsylvania with reference to politics, Dr. Klein is of the opinion that racial antagonism exerted no controlling influence in the politics of the time—a point of view that is open to some question, though true in the main. With regard to the three major racial groups in the state—the English, the Germans, and the Scotch-Irish—he rightly concludes that the Scotch-Irish were the ablest politicians and held the lion's share of the offices, with the English a close second and the Germans a rather poor third.

Dr. Klein's book is a work of solid merit and a worthwhile contribution to the history of American politics. It has an elaborate bibliography, a good index, and twelve maps, besides other illustrative material. Its format is satisfactory, and there appear to be no typographical errors.

Pennsylvania State College.

WAYLAND F. DUNAWAY.

*Life in the Rocky Mountains: A Diary of Wanderings on the Sources of the Rivers Missouri, Columbia, and Colorado from February, 1830, to November, 1835.* By W. A. FERRIS, Then in the Employ of the American Fur Company. Edited and with a Life of Ferris and a History of Explorations and Fur Trade by PAUL C. PHILLIPS. (Denver: Fred A. Rosentstock, Old West Publishing Company. 1940. Pp. xcv, 365. \$5.00.)

ALTHOUGH portions of this interesting and for the most part accurate narrative have long been known and used by historians, the recent recovery of missing numbers of the *Western Literary Messenger* made possible this complete republication of Ferris's *Life in the Rocky Mountains*. It might have appeared in book form a century ago had not the publishing house of Carey, Lea, and Blanchard, to which the manuscript was submitted in 1836, already brought out Irving's *Astoria* and just accepted the latter's *Adventures of Captain Bonneville*. *Life in the Rocky Mountains* remained unpublished, consequently, until 1843, when, following short sketches printed in the previous year, the narrative was carried as a serial in the relatively obscure *Western Literary Messenger*, then edited by Ferris's brother.

The period 1830 to 1835, covered in the Ferris narrative, was marked by intense competition and steady financial decline among the Western fur companies. Since much of our knowledge of their activities in this period has come from the records and narratives of those employed by the Rocky Mountain Fur Company, the Ferris narrative, besides being vivid but some-



what verbose, has the added merit of describing from the standpoint of the American Fur Company the incidents of the struggle not only against its commercial rivals but also against the Indians and the other hazards of the time.

Especially interesting and valuable is the reproduction of a sketch map drawn by Ferris in 1836 covering the area in which his company operated and to which his travels refer, roughly western Wyoming, western Montana, northern Utah, and Idaho. The editor rightly describes this as one of the most accurate maps of the period, though it is not unlikely that equal or perhaps superior maps drawn by Ferris's contemporaries may yet be unearthed.

The editor, by way of introduction, has supplied a biographical sketch of Ferris, including an account of his later years in Texas, and a brief essay on Rocky Mountain exploration and trade. The footnotes accompanying the narrative itself are for the most part informing, although some inaccuracies have crept in, such as the statement that the famous landmarks, the Three Buttes, are now called "Craters of the Moon" (p. 8, n. 24). A satisfactory index concludes the book.

*University of Idaho.*

HARRISON DALE.

*The Rochester Historical Society Publications. Volume XVIII. Part I, Foreign Travelers' Notes on Rochester and the Genesee Country before 1840; Part II, Nurseries, Farm Papers, and Selected Rochester Episodes.* BLAKE MCKELVEY, Editor. Compiled under the Supervision of DEXTER PERKINS, City Historian. (Rochester: the Society. 1940. Pp. viii, 262. \$4.00.)

THIS volume is one of the most excellent in a long series of distinguished contributions to the history of Rochester and the fascinating Genesee country. It reflects the interest and enthusiasm which have developed in recent years in the restudy of local history and provides a worthwhile mark toward which many more historical societies might aim.

There is a prodigious amount of social history in these pages, many of which contain extracts from the travel diaries and observations of British and Continental travelers. Dr. McKelvey and Mrs. Myrtle M. Handy have combed all the existing printed sources relative to travel in the Rochester region before 1840, and the result is interesting not only for the comments on early Rochester and its environs but as a cross section of foreign opinion of the United States in general during these years. The accounts are not carried beyond 1840, when the number of pilgrimages to the "Flour City" was rapidly diminishing, but enough of the earlier material is either quoted or paraphrased to give us an excellent picture of an American frontier community of the 1820's and '30's. The reader feels in these pages the feverish stirring of a frontier town, with its stump-strewn roads and yards, the hectic passage of the Buffalo stages, and the glittering opulence of the Eagle



Tavern, where the visiting gentry foregathered. We see something of canal-boat life (the Erie traversed the Genesee on a viaduct which was one of the wonders of the times), and there are fleeting glimpses of such "neighboring" villages as Canandaigua and Geneva, which were stage stops on one of the main routes to the West.

The second part of the volume contains Dr. McKelvey's interesting history of the nursery industry which flourished in and around Rochester until fairly recent times, a chapter which is probably unique in American social and economic history. Harriett Julia Naylor has also contributed a good chapter on the agricultural press of Rochester which supplements the material in Demaree's recent *American Agricultural Press*. The two sections tell us a good deal about farming methods and journalism in the Genesee Valley before the Civil War.

The volume as a whole is an excellent example of the intelligent use of local source material. Bingham's edition of the travel accounts of visitors to the Niagara country, in the Buffalo Historical Society's *Publications* series, is perhaps the nearest approach to McKelvey's work, but the present volume exhibits the life of those lusty days to a greater degree. A series of illustrations, showing the falls of the Genesee at Rochester from contemporary drawings and engravings, provides a visual history of the cataract from about 1755 to 1840 and adds greatly to the beauty of the book. The typography and general format could probably not have been improved upon, making this Rochester Historical Society series one of the most notable of contemporary publishing ventures.

Only a few insignificant slips were noted. A reference to the "New York State Historical Society, *Publications*, XXX" (p. 177) remains mystifying. A cumulative bibliography or separate bibliographies for the major contributions in the book would have made the source material more accessible to scholars and would have enhanced its reference value.

*Albany, New York.*

GEORGE W. ROACH.

*Robert Dale Owen: A Biography.* By RICHARD WILLIAM LEOPOLD, Instructor in History, Harvard University. [Harvard Historical Studies.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1940. Pp. xii, 470. \$4.50.)

*The Incurrible Idealist: Robert Dale Owen in America.* By ELINOR PANCOAST and ANNE E. LINCOLN. (Bloomington: Principia Press. 1940. Pp. 150. \$2.00.)

UNTIL recently little accurate information about Robert Dale Owen had been made available to historians. The single reference to him in the American Nation series was wrong on almost every point. Later investigation set things somewhat to rights, but a little conversational research indicates that he is still hardly more than a name. The appearance of two worthy biographies—the first solid volumes so far devoted to Owen—should end this lamentable condition.

A life of Owen would be useful if only because his career must have linked together more phenomena of American social history than that of any other public man, and the special merit of Dr. Leopold's biography is that it illuminates this connection at every possible point. Thus as a young man Owen came to America in 1825 under the wing of his famous father, Robert Owen, to help found the latter's experimental community at New Harmony, Indiana. Next, after the temporal (though not necessarily the intellectual) failure of that experiment, he appeared in New York, where he conducted a free-thought, feminist, anticlerical journal in association with Frances Wright, published the pioneer American tract on birth control, and took part in the labor movement as an advocate of political action. All this, or most of it, stung the sacred cows into action and gave them a pretext ever afterward for bellowing against him. Returning to Indiana, Owen began a political career which carried him to the state legislature (1836-39) and then to Congress (1843-47). In state politics he helped to secure a modicum of aid for the public schools, the establishment of township libraries, and improvements in the property rights of widows. On the national scene political ambition overshadowed his reforming zeal; his contribution to human progress during two terms in Congress whittles down to a part in founding the Smithsonian Institution, which he tried to make a center of popular education but only succeeded in burying in a cluttered Norman pile. His descriptive brochure on the building, however, places him in a more favorable light as the advocate of a distinctive American architecture free from bondage to traditional European styles.

On the slavery issue Owen at first took a compromise stand as befitted a party Democrat, in spite of his opposition to slavery in principle. With the outbreak of the war, however, he rallied to the Northern cause. His pamphlets on union and emancipation circulated widely; his ideas on the latter subject may even have influenced Lincoln's proclamation. Before the end of the war Owen served on the Freedmen's Commission and did valuable work on a commission to audit and adjust the claims of munitions manufacturers. His last political effort was to propose a Fourteenth Amendment which would have guaranteed the suffrage to Negroes; the plan had influential support though it failed of adoption.

The remainder of Owen's life was spent for the most part in promoting spiritualism. As a former agnostic he professed to approach the subject with scientific detachment; two books on ghostly phenomena won him an international reputation, and his researches appeared in the respectable pages of the *Atlantic Monthly*. But a bad choice of mediums brought sudden ridicule upon him and caused the *Atlantic* to shrink away from the dubious enterprise. It did not, however, disturb his own faith, and he died in the arms of spiritualism in 1878.

"Versatile" is the word most frequently used by the present authors to describe their subject. But in Dr. Leopold's opinion this quality was a

hindrance to Owen's success. Considering his gifts, this may have been so, for neither of these biographies rates Owen as a man of supreme talent. Both, however, claim for him a number of solid achievements and regard his present eclipse as unjustified. The authors make much of Owen's skill as a writer and controversialist, of his "fund of anecdote", his "dry, engaging humor", his brilliant, sparkling, epigrammatic style. One of the best ways to restore Owen's fame might have been to exploit this treasury. Yet it must be confessed that little of his radiance shines through these biographies, either in direct quotation or at second hand. In fact his critics seem to have given better than he returned.

Though much less comprehensive than Dr. Leopold's work, the Pancoast and Lincoln volume supplements it at some points and should not be overlooked on account of its briefness. The shorter study, however, unfortunately lacks an index.

*New York University.*

DONALD O. WAGNER.

*Federal Control of the Western Apaches, 1848-1886.* By RALPH HEDRICK OGLE. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 1940. Pp. viii, 259. \$2.00.)

THIS is the story, related with exceptional thoroughness and impartiality, of how the Apache Indians were dealt with from the time of their passing from under the jurisdiction of Mexico to that of the United States in 1848 to the capture of Chief Gerónimo in 1886. Besides being a historical narrative of absorbing interest it is, in the breadth and completeness of its scope and in its observations upon official conduct and policies, a treatise on United States-Indian relations, scholarly in the highest degree.

In his search for facts and enlightenment upon them the author explored every imaginable avenue of information, such, for example, as the ingoing and outgoing correspondence of the War and Interior departments and their several bureaus, likewise the newspaper files of this and that library or historical society. The result is, at times, startling. From the beginning to the end of his findings there are certain things that stand out in stark nakedness, making the very title of the book seem ironical. Witness the failure of the Federal government to take a long-range view that would permit it to measure up to its responsibilities to a subject people; its powerlessness to resist local pressure from the forces of aggression, corruption, and spoliation; and, finally, its failure to eliminate once for all the divided authority, the rivalry between civil and military agencies, which, more than anything else, precluded it from ever formulating a constructive native policy to which it was willing to compel compliance or itself, for any great length of time, to adhere.

In strong contrast to civilians and to military men, volunteers and regulars, who urged relentless war even to the point of extermination and obsti-

nately refused to condone, no matter what the extenuating circumstances, figure a few who had more of the milk of human kindness in their make-up, more of the sense of plain ordinary justice. In the fifties there was Dr. Michael Steck and in the seventies, John P. Clum. There was also the Board of Indian Commissioners, who tried hard and did something toward ameliorating a disgraceful and terrible situation. Inadequacy of funds contributed much to an almost universal and deplorable inadequacy in all things else. Final defeat for the Apaches was, of course, inevitable; but the struggle was long drawn out, and the end, when it came, must have brought relief to conquered and conquerors alike.

*Aberdeen, Washington.*

ANNIE HELOISE ABEL HENDERSON.

*John Lothrop Motley: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes.* By CHESTER PENN HIGBY, Professor of History, University of Wisconsin, and B. T. SCHANTZ, Instructor in English, Colgate University. [American Writers Series, Harry Hayden Clark, General Editor.] (New York: American Book Company. 1939. Pp. clxi, 482. \$1.25.)

*Francis Parkman: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes.* By WILBUR L. SCHRAMM, Assistant Professor of English, University of Iowa. [American Writers Series.] (*Ibid.* 1938. Pp. cxliv, 498. \$1.25.)

It is, of course, no surprise that the three historians included in a series devoted to American writers are Motley, Parkman, and Prescott. The volume on Prescott has been announced for early publication. If the historical profession were today to select for a historical Hall of Fame the American historians who have displayed the greatest power and skill as scholars, only Parkman of these three would receive many votes. But if, as is the case, the criteria of selection were standards of scholarship that command respect among scholars and literary qualities that entitle the histories to be treated as American literature, these three authors would almost certainly be chosen with only Henry Adams as a dangerous competitor. This fact could be made, and indeed has often been made, the subject of historiographical discussion.

These two volumes were prepared according to a common plan. In each case there is an essay, amounting to over one hundred pages and containing, in addition to a biographical sketch, an analysis of the historian's political and social philosophy and an evaluation of his scholarly and literary achievements. Then follow, after a bibliography, selections from letters, diary, and minor writings, and finally, occupying the bulk of each book, selections from the histories. Passages from all of the histories are included. They are unconnected by any text or summaries. They are in most instances under five pages in length.

Since this series is obviously intended for use in university classes, the volumes should be judged not as contributions for scholars but as instruments for teachers. The introductory essays are certainly valuable for students, but the rest of each volume is of little or no value. History cannot be understood or appreciated as literature when broken into small pieces which have no connection with each other. History is a story, and there must be unity, continuity, and development. Who would not prefer to have a student hear an entire Beethoven symphony rather than a disconnected series of measures taken from all of Beethoven's compositions? Surely students would gain a better understanding of Parkman and Motley as historians and as literary artists by reading any one volume instead of the same number of pages of unrelated fragments from all their histories. This is true even though the fragments have been carefully selected so as to include the passages containing the most dramatic action, the most colorful scenes, and the most brilliant portraits of the actors.

To scholars the introductory essays alone have any value, for the reprinting of even obscure items, such as Motley's address on "Historic Progress and American Democracy", is merely a convenience. The extent of the scholarly contribution made is limited by the fact that the introductions were written primarily for students and are frankly based on existing scholarly literature. There is in each, but especially in the Motley essay, a laudable exposition of the ideas and prepossessions that the historians absorbed from the intellectual atmosphere in which they lived. Yet the space devoted to these subjects is too limited to permit a significant contribution to be made. In the Motley essay there are several annoying repetitions and a few footnotes so pedantic that even a professor will wince.

*University of Washington.*

W. STULL HOLT.

*The Letters of John Fiske.* Edited by his Daughter, ETHEL F. FISK. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1940. Pp. 706. \$7.50.)

WHILE this collection contains many letters not hitherto published, there are numerous omissions of letters which appear or to which allusions are made in Clark's *Life and Letters of John Fiske*. Conspicuous among the omissions are letters which Fiske wrote to distinguished men in England. Mrs. Fisk, in most cases, includes only the replies, which thus lose a part of their meaning, and places them as enclosures with letters which Fiske wrote to his wife or to his mother or to others. Assuming apparently that the letters are self-explanatory, Mrs. Fisk offers no preface or introduction and gives scarcely any assistance along the way in placing names and allusions. In the entire volume there are only about a dozen very brief notes.

So many of the letters in Mrs. Fisk's collection appear also in Clark's work that extended comparisons are possible and are likely to shock readers sensitive to textual variations. Here are some specimens:

Clark	Mrs. Fisk
"Terrible!!!" (I, 44)	"Terrible!" (p. 2)
"Grandma" (I, 62)	"Mr. Lewis" (p. 9)
"After the time of Henry Eno leaving here—which will be the last of next month, I shall commence the freshman studies . . ." (I, 64)	"The last of July I shall begin the freshman studies for Yale . . ." (p. 11)
"May 26th, 1857."	"May 17, 1857."
"My dear Mother,—"	"Dear Mother:"
. . . "etc., etc., etc." (I, 72)	. . . "and so on." (pp. 14-15)
"I am perfectly in love with Lewes." (I, 481)	"I am perfectly bewitched with Lewes." (p. 261)
"He [Lyell] is probably from 80 to 85 years old." (I, 491)	"He is eighty six years old." (p. 292)
In letters to his wife Fiske frequently refers to himself as "Hezzy"	"Hezzy" becomes "I" or "me"
"Hezzy's back in London!" (I, 526)	"I am back in London." (p. 327)
"Huxley seems to have taken a great fancy to Hezzy." (I, 486)	"Huxley also seems to have taken a great fancy to me." (p. 280)
"'pickerwows' of it" (I, 509)	"pictures of it" (p. 317)
"Tell Mrs. McKenzie . . ." (I, 514)	"Tell Mrs. Anderson . . ." (p. 320)
"Thursday evening called at the 'orrid 'Uxleys'." (I, 529)	"Thursday evening I called at Huxley's." (p. 329)
Many times the Huxleys are called the 'orrid 'Uxleys'	Has no 'orrid 'Uxleys'
"After this <i>magnificent repast</i> . . ." (I, 530)	"After dining . . ." (p. 329)
" <i>terremenjuously</i> " (II, 120)	" <i>tremendously</i> " (p. 386)
"Wednesday, June 11, 1879. Anniversary of the day when I first met you, my angel . . ." (II, 126)	"Wednesday, June 11. Anniversary of the day when I first met you, my peerless beauty . . ." (p. 389)

In Mrs. Fisk's collection the letters run on with no hint of any omissions or interpolations or departures from the actual texts. In Clark's work such niceties of editing are so carefully observed as to raise a suspicion that Mrs. Fisk has felt free to interpolate information not found in the texts, to im-

prove her father's choice of words, to translate pet names and playful expressions into more dignified equivalents, and to rephrase wherever necessary to preserve continuity. It would be unfair to say that, as compared with Clark, Mrs. Fisk has spoiled any of her father's letters, but she has certainly in places reduced their exuberance. It is not unfair to say that the many letters which Mrs. Fisk has added to those previously published throw new light on Fiske's versatility and furnish fresh examples of his literary charm. Her collection should be gratefully received by a wide public. But neither her volume nor Clark's panegyric can satisfy a critical reader of Fiske's works.

Columbia University.

HENRY JOHNSON.

*Cadiz to Cathay: The Story of the Long Struggle for a Waterway across the American Isthmus.* By MILES P. DuVAL, JR., Commander, United States Navy. [Stanford Books in World Politics, Graham Stuart, Editor.] (Stanford University: Stanford University Press. 1940. Pp. xix, 554. \$5.00.)

THIS is a comprehensive, well-documented diplomatic study. Commander DuVal begins by tracing the evolution of the Isthmian canal idea from 1502 to 1850. He then treats the development of the United States canal policy from 1850 to the passage of the Spooner Act, including considerable material on certain leaders responsible for the choice of the Panama route. All of this is accomplished in the first 170 pages.

The next hundred pages are devoted to the negotiation and rejection of the Hay-Herrán Treaty. The same amount of space is required for the Panama Revolution of 1903—antecedents, execution, recognition of the new state, and early independence difficulties. One chapter suffices for the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty. The chapter "In Perspective" concludes the treatise.

The appendixes (sixty-four pages) include texts of all the relevant canal treaties (1846-1936); John Bassett Moore's famous memorandum of August 2, 1903; and President Theodore Roosevelt's proposed message recommending the seizure of the Panama route in case of Colombia's failure to cooperate. The fifteen-page bibliography indicates familiarity with the principal source materials. The index is adequate.

The extensive use of the Herrán Papers (at Georgetown University) helps in the understanding of the Colombian side of the negotiations of 1901-1903, though the Colombian nineteenth century background is much neglected. These papers, however, might have been better "digested". The constant use of long quotations gives the impression of "padding" and adds little to the value of the study. Since the author evidently spent much time in research in Washington, it is not clear why he relied almost wholly on published government documents—the originals were in the National Archives—and why he did so little work among the newspapers and periodicals except for the period of 1902-1904. Engineering and geographical peri-



odicals of the late nineteenth century contain much pertinent canal material.

There are other shortcomings which the present reviewer feels compelled to mention. The United States delegates did not arrive at the Panama Congress (1826) too late (pp. 26, 425). They never arrived—one died en route from Bogotá, the other never left the United States. The construction of an Isthmian canal was not a part of Polk's policy (p. 35). He never considered it necessary to negotiate the Treaty of 1846. The truth is the treaty was negotiated without instructions and submitted to the Senate with presidential misgivings.

Commander DuVal makes no mention of the United States-Nicaragua canal negotiations of 1876-77. Nor does he seem to suspect that the Congress for the Consideration of an Inter-oceanic Canal (Paris, 1879) was "packed" in favor of De Lessep's Panama project. He seems objective enough in tracing the activities of Dr. Amador, William Nelson Cromwell, John Bassett Moore, even President Theodore Roosevelt, but Philippe Bunau-Varilla completely captivates him. Few historians question the ability of this wily French engineer-diplomat, but many question his disinterestedness in the Panama affair and especially his own account of his great deeds.

Finally, most students of diplomacy would disagree with Commander DuVal's conclusions that circumstances forced the United States' hand in 1903 (p. 431); that Roosevelt did not "take" Panama but was "taken" by it (p. 444).

Yet this study is valuable and timely. Although it contains little that is new or revolutionary, it does present a very complicated story in an extremely readable form.

*Berea College.*

E. TAYLOR PARKS.

*William E. Chandler, Republican.* By LEON BURR RICHARDSON. [American Political Leaders, edited by Allan Nevins.] (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 1940. Pp. xiii, 758. \$5.00.)

WILLIAM E. Chandler of New Hampshire, not an unusually useful or important statesman, is likely to take high rank as a specimen because of his great care in preserving the detailed record of his long career as a political tactician. Few politicians have had either the orderly habits which lead to the accumulation of letter files or perhaps the complete frankness and certainty of their own virtue which might make them ready to let posterity look at the record. But Chandler had both a sense for order and a conviction of rectitude. In the elaborate collections which Professor Richardson has found in the Library of Congress and in the New Hampshire Historical Society the behavior of the politician is fully preserved. In this book it is displayed as completely as could be desired—how completely may be realized if one considers the poverty of documentation for such of his contemporaries as Marcus Alonzo Hanna and Matthew Stanley Quay.

In his old age, being something of a "mosquito", Chandler made politi-

cal virtue his objective, handling it sometimes so as to make it less attractive than the vice which it confronted. In his earlier and more active life none need say that his political influence was vicious. It was, however, of his time and intensely practical. It was grounded upon his firm conviction that only the Republican party was fit to rule. A suitable majority on election day was a condition precedent for this rule. In the ways and means of procuring these majorities Chandler was a past master. He got little out of it directly for himself; though in the intervals between periods of party activity his services as open lobbyist made him financially independent.

Acting promptly when the returns from the election of 1876 came in, he may have saved the presidency from Tilden; and the action may have been due to his being on the spot with a head crowded with practicalities mastered in the management of four presidential contests. Professor Richardson presents material for a better understanding than we have hitherto had of the case for Hayes and for a strengthening of the suspicion that in spite of general fraud and open intimidation no serious injustice was done to the Democratic candidate.

There is fresh material, too, on the genesis of the new American navy, which took its start while Chandler was Secretary in the cabinet of Arthur. We have had, since that day, plenty of experience of the damage which the uninformed and the malicious may do to the managers of American preparedness. The story here uncovered tends to restore confidence in the good faith of those who had to start from scratch and work with what they had in the building of an American unit of defense.

In the Senate and during his "lameduck" service on the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission Chandler rounded out his active public life, making at every step a record of his procedure. His world left him while he had nearly two decades of life to go; he saw another leader, Gallinger, capture his state; he was forgotten before he died. But his record should be studied by those who wish to understand the ethic and practice of American politics in the half century after the Civil War. Professor Richardson has arranged the story clearly and dispassionately.

*University of California.*

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

*The Correspondence between Benjamin Harrison and James G. Blaine, 1882-1893.* Collected and edited by ALBERT T. VOLWILER, Professor of History, Ohio University. [Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society.] (Philadelphia: the Society. 1940. Pp. xii, 314. \$3.50.)

THIS interesting collection of some 350 items of correspondence between the two dominating Republican figures of our politics in the decade of the 1880's may be taken as a prolegomenon to the full-length biography of Benjamin Harrison which, we understand, Professor Volwiler has in preparation. Although there are one letter of 1882 and a half-dozen letters of 1884, the important political correspondence actually covers the years 1888-92. It

reveals clearly the embarrassment felt by Blaine's family and friends at having their idol relegated to a second place in the party which he had led for a score of years and furnishes a progressive comment on the estrangement between the President and his Secretary of State which was to end in the curt resignation of the latter and his ill-advised contesting of the Republican nomination of 1892 with his chief.

Professor Volwiler notes the difficulty presented by the disparity between the mass of carefully preserved material in the Harrison Papers and the skimpy remains of Blaine's correspondence that are discoverable. For example, we have less than a thousand items in the Blaine Papers in the Library of Congress as compared with seventy thousand in the Harrison Papers. Blaine was accustomed to write in his own hand and seldom made copies of his letters. As for the mass of correspondence which he had accumulated through many years, he gave instructions to his secretary, Louis Dent, one day in 1891 to take it all out and burn it. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that we have in the Blaine Papers only twenty-five letters to him from Harrison. The perusal of the Blaine-Harrison correspondence is something like listening to one end of a telephone conversation.

Professor Volwiler in his introduction calls attention to the similarity between the strained relations of Blaine and Harrison and those of Tyler and Webster, Taft and Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson and Bryan, and Franklin Roosevelt and Alfred Smith. Particularly apt is his quotation from Blaine's own *Twenty Years of Congress* (written before his rivalry with Harrison developed), scoring Buchanan for the humiliating terms on which he consented to enter President Polk's cabinet. The closing words of the quotation might be applied to Blaine's estimate of his own position (certainly to his wife's and friends' estimate of it) in the years of his incumbency of the same office that Buchanan held: "Mr. Buchanan was an older man than Mr. Polk, was superior to him intellectually, had seen a longer and more varied public service, and enjoyed a higher personal standing throughout the country."

Just after Blaine's death on January 27, 1893 (nearly eight months, and not "six", as Volwiler says, after his resignation), President Harrison began the composition of a memorandum which was to review the relations between him and his Secretary of State, possibly as an offset to the biography of Blaine which his relative, Gail Hamilton, was preparing. Professor Volwiler prints (pp. 294-303) as much of this "Private Memoranda" as Harrison completed, which unfortunately covered only the presidential campaign of 1888, the selection of the cabinet, and a single paragraph on the beginning of Blaine's work in the State Department. Mr. Harrison (now retired from the presidency) was urged to complete the document, but for reasons best known to himself he got no further than outlining the topics (pp. 302-303) which remained to be treated.

*Columbia University.*

DAVID S. MUZZEY.

*Norwegian Migration to America: The American Transition.* By THEODORE C. BLEGEN, Dean of the Graduate School in the University of Minnesota. [Publications of the Norwegian-American Historical Association.] (Northfield: the Association. 1940. Pp. xii, 655. \$3.50.)

At the end of this book, speaking of the Norse-American Centennial (1925), Dean Blegen declares: "It was now evident that the time had come for an integrated program of collecting, editing, and scholarly writing . . . employing the professional techniques and standards of modern historical research." Thus was born the Norwegian-American Historical Association, credit for whose monumental production Dean Blegen charmingly gives to others without even mentioning himself, though in the capacity of managing editor he, more than anyone else, deserves it.

In his earlier volume, *Norwegian Migration to America, 1825-1860*, the author described the origins and development of the earlier Norwegian emigration; here he follows the migration through its climax to virtual conclusion but emphasizes what is more important—and for the first time in the best traditions of historical scholarship—namely, the adjustments made by the body of Norwegian immigrants to the American environment.

Obviously, the first problem confronting the immigrant was that of achieving a sound economic basis for existence in the New World. Difficult as this might be for the individual during the first few years, it is clear from Blegen's book that the Norwegian immigrant group could hardly, with all the wisdom of Solomon, have chosen a more fortunate century for the advancement of their economic fortunes in America than that of 1825-1925. Free land, industrial expansion, and a booming commerce provided almost unlimited opportunities, though for the most part Norwegian immigrants and their children lacked the capital for success in industry and large-scale commerce.

So predominant was the religious interest among Norwegian-Americans of the first and second generations that other cultural interests may be said to have been incidental thereto. Unceasing theological controversy, often on a very abstract basis, as, *e.g.*, the slavery controversy, whetted argumentative and analytical qualities. The pastors, particularly in the synod, boldly assumed theological and cultural leadership; and yet the undercurrent of lay determination not to submit to clerical dominance, very strong in Norway, showed itself clearly both in the discussions concerning slavery and in those concerning public versus parochial schools.

Reading Dean Blegen's excellent chapters on the immigrant press, schools, cultural frontiers, politics, and folkways, the reviewer finds it significant that in these respects the emergence of the common man in Norway itself coincided chronologically with immigrant foundations in America. From this important point of view it is almost an error to speak of an "old country" and a "new country". Thus, perhaps, is most plausibly explained the prompt entrance of Norwegian pioneers into American political life.

This volume constitutes a major contribution to American history. The format and craftsmanship of the book are very good; typographical errors are practically not to be found. One curious omission from the discussion of music among the Norwegian-Americans is noted: Professor Carlo A. Sperati and his Luther College Concert Band. They have made a substantial contribution to the field of instrumental music. The author's complete technical competence and professional integrity are evident upon every page. When other national groups in the United States find themselves historians of equal stature, future Americans will be able to understand their origins.

*Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.*

B. J. HOVDE.

*The Immigrant in American History.* By MARCUS LEE HANSEN. Edited with a Foreword by ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1940. Pp. xi, 230. \$2.50.)

MARCUS Lee Hansen knew that both Europe and America must be the field of research for anyone who would master the history of American immigration. Himself the son of immigrant parents, he had a burning desire to make a final evaluation of the role of the immigrant in American history. His research in Europe and in this country extended over many years and provided him with an almost incredible mass of detail from which his musing mind sought to distill the meaning of this overwhelming phenomenon of "mankind in motion". He painted on a broad canvas. He had a vivid historical imagination, but he never lost the balance of a scholar or generalized without adequate supporting data. He ventured successfully into what he called "that dim continent of knowledge called social history".

This collection of essays is Hansen at his mature best. The essays are the mellow fruit of years of study and reflection. They are written in a charming style, warmed with deep understanding of the hopes and aspirations, successes and failures, of the people from many lands who helped to build America and whose lives Hansen knew from firsthand observation and experience.

Five of these essays are published here for the first time. The first is entitled "Migrations Old and New". "The Odyssey of the Emigrant" is a moving account of the journey from the old home to the new and is told in such simple, human terms that one almost overlooks the fact that it is based on a detailed study of thousands of records that throw light on immigration and the immigrant traffic. The essay on "Immigration and Expansion" describes the immigrants as "fillers in" in the expansion of America, in accordance with the Turner thesis. In "Immigration and Democracy" Hansen concludes that the immigrant was the champion of the American system of free enterprise, a capitalist at heart, and a stabilizer of American democracy. "Immigration and Culture", one of the best essays in the book, is concerned with those elusive factors that have influenced the growth of American culture, and only a reader who is himself thoroughly familiar

with this field of research will wholly appreciate the vast amount of specific facts that have been woven so unobtrusively into Hansen's account.

Space will not permit detailed comment on the remaining essays. The one on "Immigration and Puritanism" is reprinted from *Norwegian-American Studies* and "The Second Colonization of New England" from the *New England Quarterly*. "Migration across the Northern Border" was expanded into a book, *The Mingling of the Canadian and American Peoples*, which was published posthumously in 1940. The concluding essay on "Immigration as a Field for Historical Research" first appeared in this *Review* about fifteen years ago. It will be reread many times, for it contains a list of topics and suggestions for further research sufficient to keep an army of scholars busy for many years to come. Hansen saw the problem steadily and saw it whole.

Oberlin College.

CARL WITTKÉ.

*The American Nation: A History of the United States from 1865 to the Present.* By JOHN D. HICKS, Professor of History in the University of Wisconsin. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1941. Pp. xvii, 733, liii. \$3.50.)

*Recent America: A History of the United States since 1900.* By HENRY BAMFORD PARKES. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1941. Pp. viii, 664. \$4.50.)

THESE two admirable textbooks of recent American history have a great deal in common and may be considered as typical representatives of some recent trends in textbook construction. They are factual, objective in tone, frank and courageous in their dealing with recent problems and national scandals, interested primarily in economic developments and social welfare rather than in wars or party politics. Mechanically they are almost perfect, with good bibliographies, convenient charts and tables, adequate indexes, and attractive formats. Errors, whether of the printer or the author, are at a minimum.

But the resemblance goes even deeper. I have called both books "objective", and so they are in the sense of avoiding the open praise of certain men, parties, and movements or the direct disparagement of others. It is no longer the fashion to write in the manner of Froude or Macaulay and call one man a hero and another a villain. A textbook, however, if it is more than a chronicle or a manual of dates and events, almost always has some underlying philosophy which can be read between the lines if not in them; and it is impossible to mistake the sympathy of both authors for tendencies that are commonly labeled "liberal" or "progressive" as contrasted with those which are usually termed "conservative" and "traditional". A New Dealer will peruse either text with more pleasure than an Old Dealer. We Americans, like the British, have a "Whig tradition" in history writing, followed by most of the best practitioners.

There are, of course, differences in the textbooks, though they are less striking than the resemblances. Professor Hicks, whose volume supplements his *The Federal Union*, carries the story from 1865 to the third election of President Roosevelt; Mr. Parkes begins his actual narrative with the twentieth century, though he has several introductory survey chapters which treat the nineteenth century as a background to the new time. Professor Hicks has a single bibliography at the end and makes much use of charts and cartograms throughout the text; Mr. Parkes, on the contrary, has chapter bibliographies and groups his statistical tables at the end of the book. Perhaps the most important difference is that Mr. Parkes is more of a generalizer. It is characteristic that whereas Professor Hicks ends his volume with an account of the 1940 election, Mr. Parkes closes his with a discussion of the relative strength of "traditionalism" and "instrumentalism" in the American national philosophy.

*University of Michigan.*

PRESTON SLOSSON.

*John D. Rockefeller: The Heroic Age of American Enterprise.* By ALLAN NEVINS. Two volumes. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1940. Pp. xiii, 683; x, 747. \$7.50.)

THE goal which Professor Nevins set for himself in this biography was to review all the transactions of Rockefeller's life, "both candidly and carefully, without prejudices or preconceptions". To this end he devoted his energies to the examination of a prodigious quantity of source material, much of which had never been exploited before. In addition to the already well-thumbed volumes of committee reports and judicial proceedings, he has made use of a greater quantity of pamphlet, periodical, newspaper, and manuscript material than any previous writer on the subject, and he has had free access to the Rockefeller family papers. It seems evident that the author could never have performed this herculean task without assistance, and he is at pains to point out his indebtedness to a long list of collaborators. But his brand is upon every page, and the final judgments are distinctly his own. Rockefeller, he concludes, has been overblamed by his enemies and overpraised by his friends. He was neither sinner nor saint. The "prime significance" of his career lies in the fact that "he was a bold innovator in both industry and philanthropy; that he brought to the first a great unifying idea, which he insisted should be thoroughly tested, and to the second a stronger, more expert, and more enduring type of organization" (II, 714).

That Rockefeller has captivated his biographer seems not open to doubt. Mr. Nevins likes and admires the leading hero of America's "heroic age". He admits that young Rockefeller thought "more of business than of books" and that he lacked a "broad or rich view of life". But all this the author explains by means of the Rockefeller family tree (which he has been at great pains to explore) and the "pinching effects of the frontier". From his ancestors and from his environment young Rockefeller acquired "caution,



reticence, forethought, and acquisitiveness" (I, 76). Like many another wide-awake young man of his time he saw in "the development of the resources of the half-explored continent" an opportunity and a challenge. Business was a "great game"—the one really great American game—and for those who played for high stakes the profits were more incidental than important. Rockefeller was rewarded with astounding success, and he won astounding profits; but his real interest lay, so Mr. Nevins believes, in creating order where once only chaos had reigned, in producing an economic engine that would work and work efficiently.

The somewhat dubious methods by which Rockefeller built up his great trust are by no means lost on the author, who confesses, for example, that although the "brutally aggressive rebate-contracts" of the South Improvement Company "were quite outside the pale of business ethics, even in that loose period", Mr. Rockefeller "sincerely persuaded himself that the . . . scheme was just" (I, 336). But in general Mr. Nevins holds that the role of the Standard, as it approached monopoly, was primarily that of the "benevolent policeman" whose duty it was to discipline the railroads and to maintain order among the pipe-line owners, the producers, and the refiners. Restrictions on competition, even at the expense of eliminating the weak, are condoned because they paved the way for "a less chaotic and incalculable system". Procedures that a generation later would have been regarded as unthinkable are defended as the inevitable by-products of the "heroic age of American enterprise", which, like the buccaneering age of Drake and Hawkins, was free to improvise its rules of conduct as it went along. Not until gasoline supplanted kerosene as the principal output of the refineries did Standard relax its grasp. Then, with the assurance that its big-business competitors would not indulge in "irresponsible" and "savagely destructive" practices, it stood ready at last to live and let live (II, 430). Needless to say, this rosy picture of Rockefeller's rule contrasts markedly with the opinions of such "muckrakers" as Ida M. Tarbell and such later investigators as Gustavus Myers and J. T. Flynn. The observer from the side lines is apt to believe that if Rockefeller's critics have overplayed their hands, so also has his chief defender, Mr. Nevins.

To many readers of these volumes the fact that Rockefeller retired from the active direction of Standard Oil policy as early as 1897 will come as a surprise. Although he retained the office of president for many years after the turn of the century, the actual direction of Standard affairs had by this time passed to John D. Archbold and others, who were technically in subordinate positions (II, 428). The result was unfortunate for Rockefeller's reputation, since as head of the corporation he was charged with many crimes of which he knew nothing. During these years he was turning his attention more and more actively to philanthropy. Always a giver from conviction, he now studied how best he might give largely and well. He



was by no means the first to engage in systematic philanthropy, but Mr. Nevins is on safe ground when he insists that Rockefeller planned and organized his gifts both thoughtfully and conscientiously. The huge foundations that he and his son caused to be set up became indeed "models for large-scale philanthropy in this and other lands" (II, 713).

Mr. Nevins's style is felicitous, and interest in his work holds up surprisingly well in view of its length. There are times, however, when the reader begins to wonder if this experienced writer, like so many graduate students, simply cannot bear to sacrifice any of his notes. Half as long, the book would have been twice as good. Sometimes, as in Volume I, page 476, the author's imagination gets going in a thoroughly unhistorical fashion. One wonders, too, if economists will feel satisfied with his rather sketchy view of how the Standard Oil Company really conducted its business. But by and large this is a most important contribution to American history and one of which its author may well feel proud.

*University of Wisconsin.*

JOHN D. HICKS.

*The American Impact on Great Britain, 1898-1914: A Study of the United States in World History.* By RICHARD HEATHCOTE HEINDEL, Department of History, University of Pennsylvania. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1940. Pp. ix, 439. \$4.00.)

DR. HEINDEL has produced a remarkable book, "one of the first efforts on a broad scale to see how one nation gets its ideas about another, and what use one nation makes of another's experience". He recognizes fully the fact of parallelism—that correspondence may "be due to the same causes acting in both countries rather than to any direct influence"—a recognition that increases the value of his work as an objective study in what is very largely a new field of research.

The period selected is 1898-1914, after the Spanish-American War had stimulated attention to the United States in many fields besides diplomacy. The method adopted was "field study", seventeen thousand miles of travel, including over eight hundred selected and prearranged interviews, in addition to a "documentation approfondie", to use a phrase once so popular at Geneva.

The result of these researches is an objective study of the "American impact on Great Britain", *i.e.*, "knowledge of or interest in the United States, the opinions and attitudes about it, and the imitation, modification or use of the American example".

The chapter headings hardly do justice to the treatment of the subject matter. "The American Peril", "Business Not as Usual", and "The Industrial Giant" contain a penetrating analysis of the impact of American industry and commerce upon British industry and commerce. "Pleasure or Something" is a careful exposé of the influence exerted by American films

on Britons, young and old. There seems no reason why this subject should be so titled and separated from the two chapters dealing with "The American Impact in British Social and Cultural History".

The information is there, however, on almost every conceivable subject—naval strategy, American furniture, tariffs, low flash point oil, trade unions, the law of contract, Anglo-American historical conference, the drama, Sunday schools, hospital construction, divorce. The notes at the end of each chapter give the fullest references to books and magazines, to the daily and weekly press, and to writers and speakers of every social and intellectual type.

The book is, therefore, particularly wholesome for an Englishman. He reads therein the foolish and prejudiced statements of his fellow countrymen as well as their wise and penetrating judgments. He realizes, as never before, the profound influence that this country has exercised upon his native land. He may be tempted sometimes to doubt the value of some of the evidence produced or the extent to which the opinions quoted represented a serious body of British thought or permeated British opinion to any substantial extent. But he cannot refuse to admit the impact. And it is the impact that Dr. Heindel set out to demonstrate.

To American historians Dr. Heindel seems to issue a challenge—to investigate more fully the effect of their country's thoughts and actions on other nations. "We are not likely to understand or recognize our own nationalism until we estimate its force upon other nations." At all events he has produced a thought-provoking work, illuminating international history from a new angle.

*New York City.*

G. T. HANKIN.

*Mr. House of Texas.* By ARTHUR D. HOWDEN SMITH. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company. 1940. Pp. xi, 381. \$3.50.)

THIS biography is the work of a journalist with facility of expression and wide experience, including unusual opportunities for observation. He early made contact with Mr. House (p. 2) and developed a personal relationship so intimate that he felt free to offer suggestions and draft documents (pp. 270, 275). He apparently kept notes of various interviews and off-the-record conversations. A critical scholar, however, cannot check the accuracy or authenticity of some episodes reported in direct quotations—one of the shortcomings of journalistic writing. The author knew contemporary personalities and is familiar with the literature of the period, by Seymour, Ray Stannard Baker, Tumulty, Mrs. Wilson, and others.

The book suffers from hero-worship. Mr. House does not wholly escape criticism, but such passages are rare and softly phrased, while those of praise are frequent and sometimes fulsome. A certain loss of perspective occasionally turns the principal into the agent and the agent into the principal. There is a tendency to assign the authorship of ideas to the subject of the

biography and not to others who may have had the same idea or may have implanted it as subtly in Mr. House's mind as the writer depicts him planting ideas in the mind of Mr. Wilson. The author goes so far as to assign the basic idea of the Washington Naval Disarmament Conference to Mr. House's prevision (p. 232).

The entire volume is written without appreciation of the impropriety of exercising extensive powers while refusing to take office, enjoying the fruits of office without its burdens and restrictions. On the showing of this book, Mr. House was ready to assume authority without accepting official restraints and responsibilities and then to lay down that power in hot weather and at other inconvenient moments. Furthermore, he often exercised powers which normally fell within the purview of the duties and responsibilities of officials; he even undertook to oversee regular officers. This was certain, in the long run, to create difficulties. Although an unofficial agent is proper for short-run duties in moments of exigency, such a status over a period of years begets a habit of mind quite different from that of the temporary unofficial assistant. The author reviews the breach between the President and Mr. House wholly as a partisan of the latter, assigning the blame to unfair tactics on the part of Mrs. Wilson and others.

*Brown University.*

HENRY M. WRISTON.

*Toward a New Order of Sea Power: American Naval Policy and the World Scene, 1918-1922.* By HAROLD and MARGARET SPROUT. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940. Pp. xiii, 332. \$3.75.)

ALTHOUGH American history is studied in every school and college, little more than passing notice has commonly been given to American foreign policy. It is fortunate that this has gained a place of importance at Yale, Princeton, and Stanford and that a professor at Princeton should make a study of American naval policy. For the two are vitally related.

To the casual reader the history of the American navy has been largely episodic. Three ships of the Continental navy that survived the Revolution were quickly sold, and at the beginning of the following decade there were no warships to face the Barbary pirates or the French cruisers. At the close of the War of 1812 and the Civil War the ships that had rendered such signal service were allowed to deteriorate, and for years no effort was made to replace them. Not until about the twentieth century was the navy to be a force that was felt even in times of peace.

Thus when the rest of the world left the Western Hemisphere alone, America blundered along and had no important part in world affairs. Shortly before the Spanish-American War, however, this country became navy-minded and proceeded to build. At the beginning of the World War, 1914, the United States navy was still but a poor third. At its close it stood second, and with the immense building program that had been undertaken it promised in six or seven years to stand first. Critical-minded ob-

servers, however, expressed doubt, for there were signs of a widespread revolt against navalism. This led directly to the calling of the Washington Conference. It was the Washington Conference that pointed the way "toward a new order of sea power", and it is about the Washington Conference that this volume is built.

The opening was a dramatic scene, and it is extremely well depicted by the Sprouts. All was anticipation and expectancy, and for once an American political secret was carefully guarded. Neither British, French, nor Japanese had the slightest inkling of what the American proposal was to be. "[It] produced a sensation. Admiral Beatty, First Sea Lord of the British Admiralty, was seen to come forward in his chair, a 'slightly staggered and deeply disturbed expression' on his countenance. . . . Admiral Chatfield, one of Beatty's colleagues, 'turned red and then white, and sat immovable'." Japanese statesmen "stirred in their seats and drooped close to the table".

After the proposals came counterproposals. It was much easier to agree on capital ships than on the smaller fighting craft. Arguments revolved about cruisers, submarines, and airships, and only the most determined optimists saw any agreement that would follow.

When the limited agreement had been reached, the United States navy was given a position of parity with that of Great Britain, and the foundation was laid for Anglo-American co-operation on a much larger scale.

Cancellation of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance cleared the way for concentration of American naval forces in the Pacific. A common interest in maintaining peace and the status quo in the Far East seemingly provided the basis for parallel action in that region. And between them, the English speaking countries held a combination of economic and military weapons, against which Japan's local dominance in the western Pacific lost much of its political significance.

The Sprouts are doing a splendid service to the country in their study of American naval policy—a work of which the volume under consideration is only a part. They have read the original sources extensively and examined them critically. As they said in an earlier work, "With the fires of propaganda and of domestic politics raging around the issue of national defense the urgent need for accurate background information, impartially presented, is more pressing today than ever before." They do not hesitate to speak out. America made its mistakes in the Pacific in 1898 and in 1914 and later. As someone else has said, our foreign policy has suffered from "improvisation". Now of all times it is necessary that we should review the facts and attempt to build a consistent national policy. For this it is essential that the navy should understand what is its part and should live up to its mission.

Incidentally, for the first time a woman is vitally interested in American foreign policy and naval history. Professor Sprout and Mrs. Sprout understand the art of collaboration, and their work gains from a dual enthusiasm.

*United States Naval Academy.*

CARROLL S. ALDEN.

*Jones and Myers: Documents, American Foreign Relations* 169

*Documents on American Foreign Relations*. Volume II, July, 1939-June, 1940. Edited by S. SHEPARD JONES, Director, World Peace Foundation, and DENYS P. MYERS, Director of Research, World Peace Foundation. (Boston: World Peace Foundation. 1940. Pp. xl, 875. \$3.75.)

AT a time when all portents suggest the socialized state, it is refreshing to an individualist to find a private endowment affording serious competition to a government agency. For these *Documents on American Foreign Relations*, edited under the auspices of the World Peace Foundation, are indeed a serious competitor to the *Foreign Relations of the United States*, published annually as a government document. These *Documents*, moreover, have the advantage of timeliness over an official publication necessarily delayed from sixteen to twenty years in its release. They have a further advantage in editorial discretion, which permits the inclusion of foreign documents along with domestic when these shed special light upon American concerns. Thus wisely in this year of crisis the editors have culled from the "color" books of the various governments material that illumines a world situation to which much of America's foreign relations is an inevitable reaction.

The first document quoted is President Roosevelt's "I hate war" radio address of September 3, 1939, with its pledge, "As long as it remains within my power to prevent, there will be no blackout of peace in the United States." The rest of this stout volume is the translation of that sentiment into peace with preparedness, with the so eloquently condemned "blackout" daily drawing nearer.

Of particular interest, in retrospect, is the "Fireside Chat" of May 26, 1940, when all the world seemed lost, in which the President, doubtless mindful of the prewar imbecilities of Borah and his school of thought, reminded the country that "to those who would not admit the possibility of the approaching storm—to all of them the past 2 weeks have meant the shattering of many illusions" (p. 69). Interesting, too, is the Charlottesville speech of June 10, 1940, wherein, with almost unexampled bluntness, the President of the United States declared of Mussolini that "the hand that held the dagger has struck it into the back of its neighbor" (p. 81).

Indeed, a special charm of this serious work is its inclusion in "boards" of what the reader instantly recalls as current news. Which makes it not the less scientific. Thus successive proclamations of combat areas from which American vessels and citizens were excluded are graphically presented in the map opposite page 682; while the Declaration of Panama, approved on October 3, 1939 (pp. 115-31), is an effort to carry into international law an extension approximately one hundredfold of the traditional three-mile limit. Both of these are but a portion of a major endeavor to implement aid to the democracies without the sacrifice of neutrality—a dualism which prima facie must eventually collapse, thereby presumably affording a major

theme for Volume III of the present series, which, one trusts, will in due time be forthcoming.

One is tempted to mention further items from this rich collection, but space forbids. They are the residuary legacy of a tempestuous year. The World Peace Foundation deserves our thanks.

*Purdue University.*

LOUIS MARTIN SEARS.

*Pascua: A Yaqui Village in Arizona.* By EDWARD H. SPICER. [The University of Chicago Publications in Anthropology, Ethnological Series.] (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940. Pp. xxxi, 319. \$3.50.)

IN the 1880's, when Mexico defeated the Yaquis and undertook to exterminate them, many slipped across the border, and today in Arizona there are about 2,500 of them. They are *émigrés* of an earlier day, and they have gravitated together in some seven Arizona settlements where they live as wage earners in near-by cotton fields, ranches, and railroad yards. In their villages, however, they have preserved the group ceremonies and the communal responsibilities of their past, modified in ways consonant with their present situation. Dr. and Mrs. Spicer lived in one village of less than five hundred people, a part of the city of Tucson, and report upon its economic and ceremonial life.

The problem which took the Spicers to this village was the known lack of connection between Pascuan religion and livelihood activities. The Yaqui in Arizona earn their living as wage earners and own no land. The deer dancer, who originally danced for success in hunting, is now without function, and the ceremonial developments among the Yaqui in Arizona have no relation to wage earning. In Pascua, as in innumerable primitive tribes which have abandoned their old economics in contact with white culture, this is an adjustment to drastic social change, but it should not be forgotten that primitive religions not so coerced may concern themselves overwhelmingly with crisis ceremonial, or with the fate of the individual in the hereafter, or with many other activities not connected with success in agriculture or hunting or herding. Some recognition of this fact would have clarified the problem to be investigated.

The standard of living is very low in Pascua Village, but economic security is achieved by a network of institutionalized responsibilities which spread far and wide. A man's prestige depends upon his ceremonial participation rather than upon his earnings and his surplus. Under these circumstances economic activities have very different meanings to these Yaquis than they have to non-Yaquis in the adjacent city, and these meanings have so far changed little. Individual Yaquis, however, are avoiding or dropping leadership in the societies because they cannot afford to leave their jobs for the necessary periods. As Dr. Spicer puts it: "The culture continues to exist and even in certain respects to develop, but its existence is definitely threatened by the gradual reduction of the society which finds the culture usable."

All connections between ceremonial life and the processes of gaining a living have passed out of existence, for people who work as wage earners have no use for fertility rites. Their communal ceremonial life has survived, but the more drastic conflict between the need of money in a wage-earning economy and the time-consuming unpaid activities demanded by their culture is already foreshadowed in Pascua Village.

*Columbia University.*

RUTH BENEDICT.

*The Oakes Collection: New Documents by Lahontan concerning Canada and Newfoundland.* Edited with an Introduction by GUSTAVE LANCTOT.

Documents presented by Lady Oakes to the Public Archives of Canada. (Ottawa: J. O. Patenaude, I. S. O. 1940. Pp. 71.)

BARON Lahontan has long been an enigma to historians. His career, his philosophy, his books, his maps, his "Long River", and his death have all been subjects of controversy. Even facts known to one historian have been frequently unknown to another, so little have Lahontaniana been integrated. The editor of these new documents, in giving a résumé of Lahontan's life, makes no mention of his sojourn in Lisbon. Until recently his connection with the journal of La Salle's brother, Jean Cavelier, was unknown. Father Jean Delanglez brought out that connection and mentioned new facts in the explorer's career in his *Journal of Jean Cavelier* (1938). These facts link Lahontan vaguely with Father Hennepin and a plan to secure the lower valley of the Mississippi for England about 1699 and show that Lahontan was in Holland in 1698 and in Lisbon in 1699. Mr. Verner Crane in his *Southern Frontier* (1928) brought out Hennepin's and Daniel Coxe's relations to that plan.

Now comes Mr. Lanctot's edition of more Lahontan documents of the same period: his "Instructive Summary of the Affairs of Canada" and his "Outline of a Project to capture Quebec and Placentia". The editor comes to the conclusion that the manuscripts were prepared in Holland for the English government about the year 1696 and personally transmitted—probably to William Blathwayt, William III's "Secretary-at-War", in Holland at the time. Since Blathwayt was also the focus for the negotiations that involved Hennepin, Coxe, Iberville, and others at the time of the scramble of England, Spain, and France to secure the mouth of the Mississippi, here is a clue worth following. Quite a coterie of disgruntled French explorers and backers of explorers were in Holland between 1696 and 1700. Their intrigues with England deserve more detailed study and complete publication.

Apart from the new data's value for Lahontan himself, they are excellent for the information they afford on conditions in Canada and Newfoundland at the end of the seventeenth century. In the appendix are three other documents: a donation by Lahontan in 1684, a letter by him of 1694, and the census of New France of 1692. As illustrations one finds facsimile



pages from the two main documents and from Lahontan's letter of 1694; pictures and a plan of Quebec in the 1690's; and a plan of the enclosed post at Placentia in 1690.

*Minnesota Historical Society.*

GRACE LEE NUTE.

*The Maya and their Neighbors.* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1940. Pp. xxiii, 606. \$6.00.)

OUR knowledge of the history and culture of the ancient Maya and their neighbors in Central America is growing apace, and the historian as well as the anthropologist will be interested in this report on what has so far been accomplished. Designed originally as a collection of essays summarizing current opinion in the field of Middle American archaeology, the scope of this volume has been so extended that it actually offers the first comprehensive blueprint for the history of Maya culture. Its dedication to Professor Alfred Marston Tozzer of Harvard University is particularly appropriate in view of his pioneer work in research and teaching in the Middle American field.

The Maya, with their highly original contributions in such fields as writing, mathematics, astronomy, the calendar, architecture, and sculpture, represent perhaps the highest peak of cultural attainment in the aboriginal New World, and their manifold achievements have attracted the attention of scholars in widely diverse fields. The dated inscriptions on stelae and the monumental architecture offered the first focus of attention, but in recent years increasing attention has been paid to more humble aspects of Maya culture, with rich returns in the form of new knowledge of Maya culture and its historical development. This shift from an almost exclusive preoccupation with inscriptions, dates, and buildings should be of particular interest to historians.

While it is not possible to discuss the papers of the thirty-four contributors (most of whom have been students or associates of Professor Tozzer) in any detail, certain of their general conclusions may be briefly noted. In Part I the racial, geographical, and linguistic backgrounds necessary for an understanding of the development of Indian culture in Middle America are considered. Noteworthy here are Linton's discussion of the possible role of various types of crops and soils in cultural advancement and Kluckhohn's emphasis on the necessity for sound methodology as a basis for adequate research. Students of American Indian languages will be grateful to J. Alden Mason and Frederick Johnson for their balanced synthesis of the results of linguistic research in this area, which is summarized in both tabular and map form.

The main series of papers in this volume concerns the Maya themselves. A. V. Kidder and J. Eric Thompson consider the basic problems of the area, as seen from the highlands and the lowlands, respectively. A series of papers by Morley, Andrews, and Spinden on Maya epigraphy, chronology, and



astronomy tell the interesting story of the decipherment of the inscriptions and the various attempts to achieve a correlation with the Christian calendar. The almost exclusive concern of the stela inscriptions with the counting of time has been one of the factors forcing Maya scholars to utilize anthropological techniques in the working out of the history of Maya culture. Four papers on architecture cover this highly specialized and important aspect of Maya culture; these are followed by three papers on ceramics in which the usefulness of potsherds in establishing cultural sequences and relationships is demonstrated.

Knowledge of the cultures of the postconquest period has lagged far behind our knowledge of the earlier periods despite the presence of rich documentary sources. Oliver La Farge's outline of the probable stages of postconquest cultures in Middle America should be a stimulus to both historians and ethnologists since such knowledge is important for the understanding of the present-day problems in this area. Co-operation between historians and ethnologists in this field of "ethno-history" promises to be particularly fruitful.

The last two sections consider the northern and southern neighbors of the Maya, respectively. Middle American influences were widespread, and archaeological and comparative investigation is slowly working out the character of the contacts responsible. Of particular interest are the discussions of the relations between South and Central America in pre-Columbian times.

In summary Kroeber presents a critical synthesis of the essays in this volume and discusses their contribution to the major problems of American anthropology. Two useful tables are included, one by Kroeber comparing Mexican and Mayan pottery sequences and one by the editors in which ceramic sequences for some nine areas of the New World from 100 to 1500 A.D. are presented. Incidentally these tables are misnumbered in the text.

A particularly valuable feature of this excellent volume, in addition to the plates and figures, is the bibliography of more than one thousand items. There is also an adequate index.

*University of Chicago.*

FRED EGGAN.

*The Chorti Indians of Guatemala.* By CHARLES WISDOM. [The University of Chicago Publications in Anthropology, Ethnological Series.] (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1940. Pp. xiv, 490. \$4.50.)

THE Chorti are probably descendants of the builders of Copan, greatest of the ancient southern Mayan cities. Today they occupy an area some sixty-five miles in diameter in southern Guatemala and a small section in Honduras. Three centers were special objects of study, one in the lowland, one in the highland, and one between the two. The resulting report seems to deal primarily with the lowland *municipio* of Jocotán, the remainder of the area being referred to only where differentiation is necessary.

Contemporary Chorti culture is depicted as an amalgam of Spanish and

native elements. The latter probably were essentially Mayan, although apparently no documentary accounts of the Chorti exist comparable to those known for Yucatan. The self-sufficiency of the contemporary culture is perhaps its most interesting feature. Economically the Chorti area is nearly a self-contained unit. Most of the items not produced by the Chorti are supplied by Ladinos living in the region. In social institutions and religion a similar situation exists. For example, the Chorti regard themselves as being more genuine Catholics than their Ladino neighbors despite the inclusion in their belief and ritual of many deities and practices of native origin.

While the publishers claim that the book gives the most complete report of an economic system yet produced for the region, actually it gives relatively little on the subject. Regional specialization and general data on trade are given, but the major portion of the extensive section on material culture is a very complete description of technology rather than of economics. The Chorti are farmers and to a lesser extent hunters, fishermen, collectors, and industrialists. The annual cycle of economic and religious activities is governed almost wholly by maize. During the period of great agricultural activity industrial occupations virtually cease. An ideal Chorti family is one which produces most of its own food, especially maize, and the most complete social disparagement is reserved for the man who does not plant, even though he may be gainfully employed in some other way. The most interesting aspect of the social organization is a complicated system of intermarrying families.

In some respects *The Chorti Indians of Guatemala* is a very detailed but rather pedestrian account; in no sense is it light reading. It presents no original theses, nor has it any esoteric theoretical background. In short, it is a trifle old-fashioned, attempting to describe the culture as fully as the time and the insight of the author permitted. This the reviewer found rather a relief from present trends in anthropological works. It may not make for diverting reading, but it provides plenty of facts for the person interested in them. The account is, nevertheless, unnecessarily depersonalized, and the Chorti rarely emerge as individuals. Although there are many interesting passages on the relations between Indian and Ladino, one wishes there were more on contemporary acculturation problems and on the historical development of the Chorti culture of today. *The Chorti Indians of Guatemala* will be an important source book for solving the problems of Central American ethnology and social anthropology, but it attempts no solution of them.

*University of California at Los Angeles.*

RALPH L. BEALS.

## NOTICES OF OTHER RECENT PUBLICATIONS

### GENERAL HISTORY

*Old Routes of Western Iran.* By Sir AUREL STEIN. (London, Macmillan, 1940. pp. xxviii, 432, 425.) During the years 1932-36 the veteran explorer of innermost Asia and the far-flung northwestern borders of India made four journeys in Iran, the last and longest of which is here described. For thirteen months, beginning in November, 1935, Sir Aurel Stein traveled across six different provinces of Iran with the aim of making archaeological reconnaissance surveys of whatever remains of antiquity could be traced along the routes which historical and geographical interests induced him to follow. The result is a book which will appeal to the historian, the archaeologist, and the student of present-day Persia. The mere illustrative material (112 figures, 31 plates, 25 plans, and 8 maps from original surveys) makes the book invaluable for this section of Asia. Of chief historical importance is the fact that Stein was able to trace in the western hill tracts of Fars the old route which had seen Alexander the Great, after overcoming serious difficulties, force his passage through the Persian Gates toward Persepolis. In near-by Khuzistan province Stein studied Sassanian ruins and carried out trial excavations at prehistoric mounds of ancient Susiana, the biblical Elam. The painted pottery showed a close connection between the prehistoric culture of this region in the fourth millennium B.C. and that traced on previous explorations in British Baluchistan. A series of imposing bridges shows how important were the trade and traffic which, from Sassanian down to early Islamic times, had moved from the fertile irrigated plains of Susiana up to the plateaus of central Persia. Among the other contributions of this notable book are acute observations on Luristan bronzes and on the remains of a destroyed Parthian shrine which illustrate how widely Greek art, culture, and worship influenced Iran after Alexander's conquest. C. A. ROBINSON, JR.

*The Church of our Fathers.* By ROLAND H. BAINTON. (New York, Scribner's, 1941. pp. vi, 248, \$2.50.) It is news when a distinguished scholar finds time to write history for children. Too often the work of condensation and simplification, difficult even for one well acquainted with the subject, is left to pedagogical specialists whose knowledge is secondary and superficial. Professor Bainton, combining the equipment of the professional historian with a sympathetic understanding of the child mind, performs the task of telling the history of the Christian Church to juvenile readers with admirable skill and with unusually satisfactory results. The necessarily sketchy outline of major events is filled in with well-chosen stories—either historically accurate or carefully identified as legendary—which bring the different periods to life and awaken the interest of the young student. Controversial topics are not evaded but are treated with scrupulous fairness. The numerous illustrations, taken from contemporary sources, combine authenticity with high entertainment value. The only two major criticisms which might be made are that the author ignores European Christianity after the Counter Reformation and that he ends his narrative in the middle of the nineteenth century, giving no account of recent developments. The first of these faults is so common, in adult as well as juvenile textbooks, that our complaint is against Anglo-American scholarship in general rather than

against Professor Bainton in particular. The second defect is more serious, for children will fail to get a full sense of the continuity of the church from a history which stops short of their own time. On the whole, however, the work deserves high praise and will be a useful help to anyone who has to teach church history to young pupils.

WILLIAM WILSON MANROSS.

*Turkey.* By EMIL LENGYEL. (New York, Random House, 1941, pp. x, 474, \$3.75.)

This is not a history of Turkey, even though it pretends to be such. It abounds in flagrant inaccuracies, unfounded generalizations, and frequent perversions of fact. It would be unfair, therefore, to judge this volume, like most of Mr. Lengyel's books, according to historical standards; instead it ought to be evaluated with reference to romantic literary standards, and as such it possesses merit. Beginning with an account of the Ottoman Turks from the late Byzantine era and coming down to the present, the author has produced an interesting and, at some places, a thrilling narrative. The style is both racy and effective, especially adapted for highly colored word pictures of Moslem leaders, which include Mohammed, Suleiman the Magnificent, Kemal Ataturk, Ismet Inonu, and others equally well known. The latter part of the book, dealing with postwar Turkey, is the best from the point of view of characterization, description, and clarity. The epilogue analyzes, in view of recent developments, Turkey's position in Asia Minor in the present world struggle. The book is handsomely bound, and a varicolored map of republican Turkey may be found in the front end sheets and a map of the Ottoman Empire of 1648 in the back end sheets. There are excellent photographs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, Enver Pasha, Colonel T. E. Lawrence, and "The Younger Generation of New Turkey". The index is adequate, and it has a few cross references. There undoubtedly is, and there ought to be, a market for a book of this kind, especially during these historic days. For it offers the casual reader a good deal more information than he can gather from newspapers. It provides him with a sympathetic approach toward some of the problems and manners of the people of the Near East.

STEPHEN G. CHACONAS.

*English History in English Fiction.* By Sir JOHN MARRIOTT, Honorary Fellow (Formerly Fellow and Lecturer in Modern History) of Worcester College, Oxford, Late M. P. for the City of York. (New York, Dutton, 1941, pp. xii, 308, \$2.75.) Written "confessedly as an adventure", this book is based upon the idea that the historical novel may, with proper guidance, serve as an inspiration to the reading of historical literature. It gives a running outline of English history embellished with discussions of numerous pieces of fiction at the points where they seem to bear on the story. The author cheerfully and openly treats the question of definition with such casualness that he finds ample room for Dickens, Chaucer, and everyone else about whom he feels he has something to say. In his view, books which are not historical novels may become such with the passage of time; but he seems to have occasional qualms, as when he distinguishes between historical novels in general and those which "indisputably" or "strictly" come within this category (pp. 260, 264; see also p. 268). Any reader is bound to miss some favorites, for, of necessity, only a restricted number of novels could be discussed. Sir Walter Scott receives much attention, but *Ivanhoe*, curiously enough, gets only passing mention. Buchan appears only as a historian, and nothing at all is heard of the doughty Captain Horatio Hornblower. Generally the historical narrative proper (as well as the comment on fiction) takes a narrowly political form, only opening out briefly into other fields. One may well doubt that it will inspire readers to turn to historical fiction in order to be inspired to read history. As for accuracy, we are surely entitled

to expect that no historian nowadays will attribute the overseas discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries to the interruption of the Levant trade by the Turks (p. 215).

CHESTER KIRBY.

*Archives Year Book for South African History*. Third Year, Parts I and II. (Cape Town, Government Printer, 1940, pp. 344, xi, 242.) There is some excellent material in these two volumes. Dr. Franken's study on a Cape family in the eighteenth century is excellent as an essay and full of reward as history. This and Dr. Venter's thorough study of the Landdrosts and Heemraden carry still further the work that is being done on social and administrative history. South African historians have had so many controversial problems to study that we are poorly informed about social conditions, especially in the eighteenth century. These studies are, therefore, most welcome. Mr. Schutte's study of the L. M. S. missionary, Dr. John Philip, deals with an old and emotional issue. It was inevitable that the challenge in Professor Macmillan's *The Cape Colour Question* would be taken up. Mr. Schutte seeks to apply the severe rules of historical criticism (he quotes Langlois and Seignobos) to the writings of both Philip and Macmillan. Although he does not escape the pitfalls of partisanship, he is so entirely absorbed in problems of evidence that he tends to neglect what is, after all, the real historical problem—the place of Dr. John Philip in the history of South African race problems. All of the studies, with one exception, are written in Afrikaans.

C. W. DE KIEWIET.

*Modern Europe*. Reprinted from *The Development of European Civilization*. By CLARENCE PERKINS, University of North Dakota, CLARENCE H. MATTERSON, Iowa State College, and REGINALD I. LOVELL, Willamette University. [Prentice-Hall Books on History, edited by Carl Wittke.] (New York, Prentice-Hall, 1941, pp. xiii, 717-1174, \$3.00.)

*The Course of Europe since Waterloo*. By WALTER PHELPS HALL, Dodge Professor of History, Princeton University, and WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS, Late Professor of History, University of Minnesota. [The Century Historical Series, William E. Lingelbach, Editor.] (New York, Appleton-Century, 1941, pp. xviii, 901, \$4.00.) This is a textbook of European history from 1815 to the beginning of 1941. Attention is given to cultural, economic, and social developments as well as to political and military events. In writing it Professor Hall, as he states in his preface, has made extensive use of the late William Stearns Davis's *Europe since Waterloo* (1926).

*Constitutions of the Hawaiian Kingdom: A Brief History and Analysis*. By RALPH S. KUYKENDALL, Associate Professor of History, University of Hawaii. [Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society.] (Honolulu, the Society, 1940, pp. 60, 75 cents.) This booklet was issued in commemoration of the centennial of Hawaii's first written constitution. The Hawaiian monarchy had three additional constitutions, dated 1852, 1864, and 1887. Only excerpts from the texts are reproduced; the volume is chiefly a commentary upon the constitutions by Professor Kuykendall. The most illuminating portions of the work are the analyses of the constitutions of 1864 and 1887, each of which was effectuated by a virtual *coup d'état*. In the first instance the initiative was taken by King Kamehameha V, and the accent was on the royal prerogative and the elimination of universal suffrage. The drift was steadily away from popular government. The constitution of 1887 established cabinet government on the British model; the American Hawaiians blamed the exercise of personal power by the monarch for ills which to them had become intolerable. The suffrage requirements of this document

reflect the prevailing nervousness over the presence of Orientals. Designed to insure political peace, this constitution lasted but five and a half years; native Hawaiians in the lower house of the legislature loudly demanded a genuine popular convention. "The last act was the one played out" by the queen on January 14, 1893. Professor Kuykendall has here successfully blueprinted Hawaiian political history from 1840 to 1893. His earlier volume had already filled in the outline to 1854; we need his forthcoming second volume on Hawaiian history to complete the picture. RICHARD W. VAN ALSTYNE.

*Österrike-Ungern i bosniska Krisen, 1908-1909.* By GEORG WITTRÖCK. [Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala.] (Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri-A.-B.; Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz, 1939, pp. xv, 592, 18 kr.) This excellent monograph is in a sense a history of the international relations of the states involved in the Bosnian crisis between July, 1908, and April, 1909. A clear summary of the Dual Monarchy and the Bosnia-Herzegovina problem during the thirty years before 1908 precedes the main story, and a short but lucid statement of the results of the crisis completes it. The study rests throughout on basic source materials. Unlike Nintchich, one of his predecessors in the field, the author has made full use of the *Österreich-Ungarns Aussenpolitik, 1908-1914*, published in 1930. The only notable gap in the materials appears to be French and Italian documents which are not yet available. Wittrock is probably correct, however, in suggesting that these documents are in all likelihood of secondary importance because neither France nor Italy played a dominant part in the solution of the problem. While the author's account is detailed—over 90 pages are devoted to July-October, 1908, some 200 to the next four months, 200 to January-February, 1909, and about 130 to the solution of the question—he has mastered the detail and given unusual clarity to his narrative. Aehrenthal's enterprises culminating in the annexation of the provinces; Izvolsky's machinations and sorry role after the tail began to wag the dog; the maneuvers and squeeze plays after annexation had become a fact; the ruthless and malodorous business of preserving peace by giving Austria-Hungary what she wanted, bringing Serbia to heel and imposing humiliation on Russia, and the doings of the large fry and small who umpired the game—all are told with impressive objectivity. It is this objectivity more than anything else that turns the book into an unintended but crushing indictment of European power politics during the years that may well be called decisive in bringing on the first World War. JOHN H. WUORINEN.

*An American Symposium on the Macedonian Problem.* (Indianapolis, 20 South West Street, Central Committee of the Macedonian Political Organization of the United States, Canada, and Australia, 1941, pp. 49.)

*Poland: Key to Europe.* By RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL. Third edition. (New York, Knopf, 1939, pp. xi, 406, xv, \$3.00.)

*Has American Forgotten?: Myths and Facts about World Wars I and II.* By ESTHER CAUKIN BRUNAUER. Introduction by James T. Shotwell. (Washington, American Council on Public Affairs, ca. 1940, pp. 15, 25 cents.)

*The War in Maps, 1939/40.* Edited by GISELHER WIRSING in collaboration with ALBRECHT HAUSHOFER, WOLFGANG HÖPKER, HORST MICHAEL, ULRICH LINK. (New York, German Library of Information, 1941, pp. 70.) The main purpose of this piece of Nazi propaganda, as stated in the preface, is "to show once

more, and comprehensively, why a German victory was inevitable from the beginning, and how the Führer created the political bases upon which each of the great military undertakings was completed with well-nigh mathematical precision".

*Since 1939: A Narrative of War.* Supplement to *The World since 1914*. By WALTER CONSUELO LANGSAM, Union College. (New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. i, 103, 60 cents.)

*Prepare for Peace!* By HENRY M. WRISTON. (New York, Harper, 1941, pp. x, 275, \$2.50.)

*Guide to Bibliographies of Theses: United States and Canada.* Compiled by THOMAS R. PALFREY and HENRY E. COLEMAN, JR. Second edition. (Chicago, American Library Association, 1940, pp. 54, \$1.25, planographed.) The first edition of this *Guide* was noticed in our April, 1937, issue (XLII, 576).

## ARTICLES

R. F. ARRAGON. The Technique of Group Discussion. *Reed Coll. Bull.*, Apr.

GIUSEPPE RENSI. Il puzzle della storia. *N. Riv. Stor.*, June, 1940.

M. M. ROSSI. Esiste la storia? *Ibid.*, Oct., 1940.

BRUNO KUSKE. Die deutsche Westgrenze in ihren wirtschaftsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhängen. *Deut. Arch. f. Landes- u. Volksforsch.*, IV, nos. 3-4.

ALFRED BIRK. Urwege über die Iglauer Senke: Ein Beispiel für die Zusammenarbeit des Ingenieurs und des Archäologen. *Ibid.*

KARL LECHNER. Leistungen und Aufgaben siedlungskundlicher Forschung in den österreichischen Ländern mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Niederdonau. *Ibid.*

BARBARA KUPFFER. Das neuere deutsche Schrifttum über den deutschen Bauernstand in der Slowakei. *Ibid.*

IRMTRAUT LINDECK. Schrifttum zur Geschichte des Deutschtums in Galizien. *Ibid.*

GUSTAV SCHLEGEL. Die deutsche Namensforschung in den Sudetenländern. *Ibid.*

JÜRGEN VON HEHN. Zur baltischen Geschichte: Ein Forschungsbericht. *Ibid.*

GEORG VON RAUCH. Volks- und Staatsauffassung in Livland zur polnischen und schwedischen Zeit. *Ibid.*

FRANCIS ECKART. The Holy Crown of Hungary: The History of an Idea. *Hung. Quar.*, Winter.

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY. The Meaning of Romanticism for the Historian of Ideas. *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, June.

CARL WITTKÉ. The America Theme in Continental European Literatures. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, June.

HERMANN RAUSCHNING. Russian and German Nihilism. *Dublin Rev.*, Apr.

ALEXANDER KIRALFY. The Influence of Democracy upon Sea Power. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.*, June.

WILLY LEY. War Rockets of the Past. *Coast Artillery Jour.*, May-June.

EARL SWISHER. The Character of American Trade with China, 1844-1860. *Univ. Colorado Stud., Social Sciences*, May.

ALLAN B. COLE. Japan's First Embassy to the United States, 1860. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, Apr.

CARL C. ECKHARDT. Heinrich von Stephan, Founder of the Universal Postal Union. *Univ. Colorado Stud., Social Sciences*, May.

WALTER ZECHLIN. Das Tangerproblem und seine Lösung. *Berl. Monatsh.*, Apr.

HANSON W. BALDWIN. Military Lessons of the War. *Yale Rev.*, June.

## DOCUMENTS

E. CLOWES CHORLEY. Correspondence between Bishop Skinner of Aberdeen and the Reverend Jonathan Boucher. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, June.



ANCIENT HISTORY<sup>1</sup>

T. R. S. Broughton

*The Coregency of Ramses II with Seti I and the Date of the Great Hypostyle Hall at Karnak.* By KEITH C. SEELE. [The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization.] (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1940, pp. xiii, 95, \$2.75.) As indicated by the title, this study deals with two main problems, the construction of the Hypostyle Hall in the temple of Karnak and the coregency of Seti I and his son Ramses II. According to the author the Hypostyle Hall was begun by Harmhab. During the short reign of Ramses I the plans were changed, and the open colonnaded court, intended by Harmhab, was converted into a covered hall. The decoration of the north aisle was completed by Seti I, that of the south aisle by Ramses II. The question of the coregency has been widely discussed in the past. Seele has carefully investigated the available source material, especially wall decorations in different temples in Egypt, where he tried to draw conclusions from the representations, the royal names, and the style of the reliefs. He reaches the conclusion that Ramses II was coregent with Seti I for several years. While coregent Ramses used the prenomen *Wsr-maa-t-Re*—written in cartouches—with various epithets, similar to those used by his father, added to it. Shortly after his father's death he adopted the prenomen *Wsr-maa-t-Re-štpn-Re*. All other variants were abandoned. From the way Ramses II represented Seti I in the reliefs executed during his reign Seele draws the conclusion that Ramses II must have had high esteem for his father. The book offers a very stimulating discussion of the problems involved. The excellent plates facilitate the understanding of the discussion of individual reliefs.

HERBERT LIEBESNY.

*A Chronology of the Plays of Plautus.* By CHARLES HENRY BUCK, JR. (Baltimore, the author, care of Department of Classics, Johns Hopkins University, 1940, pp. 112, \$1.25.) This doctoral dissertation was written under the direction of Tenney Frank, and parts of it were incorporated by him in several unpublished lectures at Oxford. The author has sought to gather fresh evidence for dating the comedies of Plautus in the poet's allusions to contemporary events. The method is not novel, but it provides new and interesting results in this study. Superficially Buck's approach would seem to be more objective than others and the results more conclusive, but, as he himself recognizes, positive identification of many allusions is impossible. In his analysis of the *Cistellaria*, for example, he suggests (p. 63) that Plautus's phrase *socios novos* (l. 199) refers to several Italian towns which in 203 joined Rome. He therefore assigns the play to that year (on p. 105 the year 202 is given). He has not observed, however, that Frank, in *Anatolian Studies presented to William Hepburn Buckler* (p. 87), has argued with equal plausibility that *socios novos* refers to Rhodes and Pergamum and that, by reason of this allusion and one other, the date of the play is 201. Buck's conclusion is that the comedies, in the order which he assigns to them, reflect public opinion on politics. The Scipionic career is the main thread of the story. At first Plautus favored Scipio and his philhellenic policy. But later, when there was growing antagonism to Scipio and his policy, the poet supported the anti-Scipionic party of Cato. This hypothesis, which was anticipated by Frank, is provocative, but it cannot be said to be proved by the scant and uncertain allusions in Plautus.

SOLOMON KATZ.

<sup>1</sup> Under this and the following headings unsigned notices are, in general, contributed by the persons whose names appear at the heads of the divisions and who are otherwise responsible only for the lists of articles and documents.



*Tigranes the Great: A Biography.* By HERANT K. ARMEN. (Detroit, Avondale Press, 1940, pp. 216, \$2.00.) This work will be of little value to the historian, for it is undocumented, and both the text and the very inadequate bibliography imply an imperfect knowledge of the literature. Perhaps a reviewer who must occasionally use a Latin translation of an Armenian work is not in a position to criticize an author who uses Armenian translations of German works, but a knowledge of the latter language would seem essential for work on Armenian history. The book is written in a fresh, lively style and, in spite of many infelicities in English, might serve as a model for our duller though possibly more historical studies. Some of the errors in English provide humorous moments: "To make assurance doubly sure, Lucullus chose to insinuate Tigranes in a manner which, he knew, was of gravest moment to the king" (p. 148). Further studies on Armenia are greatly needed, and much still remains to be done in the history of that country.

NEILSON C. DEBEVOISE.

*Freedom of Speech in the Roman Republic.* By LAURA ROBINSON. (Baltimore, Furst, 1940, pp. xiii, 93, \$1.00.) Miss Robinson has chosen to write on an interesting aspect of the conflict between freedom and authority in Rome. She does not deal with the whole question of freedom of speech but with "the attitude of the Romans towards slander and libel", *i.e.*, personal invective delivered against recognizable living personages. This ought to mean a study of the laws which were so made or interpreted as to punish contumelious attacks and of the leading cases under those laws. Miss Robinson, however, spends little space or argument on that topic. The Naevius case gets at most five pages, including footnotes. Horace's satire 2.1, which is wholly devoted to a discussion (with the great lawyer Trebatius!) of the scope of satire and the sanctions on its misuse and to which Lejay gives ten pages of closely printed legal analysis, is dismissed in some fifty lines. Instead of this, Miss Robinson has spent her industry on what seems to me (on this scale) a futile and certainly an irrelevant task. She has listed most of the men who were personally attacked in speeches and pamphlets, and she has attempted to give a local habitation and a name to the characters satirized cryptonymously by Lucilius and Horace. But she advances few, if any, new theories to replace the often absurd Lucilian conjectures of Marx and Cichorius; and her identifications of many of Horace's butts are tenuous in the extreme. Under another title, we should all welcome a thorough investigation showing us what could be taken as proved or probable about the topicality and frankness of Lucilius and Horace. Miss Robinson does not give it to us; and, although she has collected some interesting material, we must regret that she did not subject it to sharper and more systematic criticism.

GILBERT HIGHET.

*The Syrian Tetradrachms of Caracalla and Macrinus.* By ALFRED R. BELLINGER, Lampson Professor of Latin in Yale College, Fellow of Saybrook College. [Numismatic Studies, No. 3.] (New York, American Numismatic Society, 1940, pp. 116, plates xxvi, \$5.00.) In 213 A.D., after the death of Geta, Caracalla began issuing tetradrachms from twenty-four mints in Syria in addition to the original three at Tyre, Antioch, and Laodicea-ad-Mare which Septimius Severus had used. This policy was continued by Macrinus and then abandoned. As Professor Bellinger states in his introduction (p. 6), Caracalla's presence in Syria on account of the Parthian expedition "furnishes an excellent reason for the great increase in the making of silver". Why the coins were issued from so many different mints is not clear, though the author suggests some possibilities. Professor Bellinger has examined critically the evidence for the attribution of the coins to each of the twenty-seven issuing mints, relying particularly on the

mint symbols placed under the eagle or elsewhere on the reverse. The series of twenty-six plates which illustrate all the types covered is a valuable feature of the volume. This excellent study will be of interest to all students of the economic history of the Roman Empire, especially for the period of the Severi.

PRESCOTT W. TOWNSEND.

*Yale Classical Studies*. Edited for the Department of Classics by AUSTIN M. HARMON, Lampson Professor of Greek, ALFRED R. BELLINGER, Lampson Professor of Latin, HENRY T. ROWELL, Assistant Professor of Latin, ROBERT O. FINK, Instructor in Classics. Volume VII. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1940, pp. 317, \$3.00.) This volume contains the publication and discussion of a Latin papyrus in rustic capitals on the recto only which was found during 1931-32 at Dura. The document, discovered in fragmentary condition in a room that was probably the *officium* of the cohorts XX Palmyrenorum, consists of a *feriale*, the only calendar extant between about 51 A.D. and 354 A.D. and likewise the sole Roman military calendar in existence. It can be dated between 224/25 and 235 A.D., during the reign of Severus Alexander. The most important fact disclosed by the *feriale* is that the official religion of the army and of the state seem to be essentially the same, while practically no considerations of military interest determined the choice of holidays. The calendar apparently represents the traditional official religion of the army, was issued by the central authorities in Rome, and was of universal validity. The document had been subject to annual revisions and had been discarded because of use or because events required extensive revisions. The holidays chosen for celebration were either selected for their festive character or were anniversaries of deities with whose cult the prosperity of Rome was intimately connected. Out of forty-one references, twenty-seven are to the imperial cult, that is, to the worship of *divi*, *divae*, and the *genius* of the reigning emperor. The *dies natales* and *dies imperii* predominate. There is a high proportion of animal sacrifices, though the *divae* and some gods receive only *supplicationes*, apparently *ture ac vino*. All foreign cults were excluded, and all observances were Roman and official. The excellent commentary is supplemented by a study (pp. 225-317) of the epigraphical evidence for the observance of public anniversaries, from which it appears that important imperial anniversaries were often selected for further official acts by members of the imperial house.

KENNETH SCOTT.

#### GENERAL ARTICLES

- HERBERT CHATLEY. Egyptian Astronomy. *Jour. Egypt. Archaeol.*, XXVI.  
 G. A. WAINWRIGHT. Seshat and the Pharaoh. *Ibid.*  
 R. O. FAULKNER. Egyptian Seagoing Ships. *Ibid.*  
 JOHNS PEDERSEN. Die Krt Legende. *Berytus*, VI, no. 2.  
 R. HERBIG. Philister und Dorier. *Jahrb. Deut. Arch. Inst.*, LV.  
 JOHN FRANKLIN DANIEL. Prolegomena to the Cypro-Minoan Script. *Am. Jour. Archaeol.*, Apr.  
 HILDEBRECHT HOMMEL. Die dreissig Trittyen des Kleisthenes. *Klio*, XXXIII, no. 3.  
 JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS. The Slaves at the Battle of Marathon. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, July.  
 GLENN R. MORROW. On the Tribal Courts in Plato's *Laws*. *Ibid.*  
 THOMAS LENSCHAU. Alexander der Grosse und Chios. *Klio*, XXXIII, no. 3.  
 ERICH BURCK. Altrom im Kriege. *Antike*, XVI, no. 3.  
 EDWARD F. D'ARMS and WILLIAM WALLACE. Supplement to the Catalogue of Greek and Roman Coins at the University of Colorado. *Univ. Colorado Stud., Social Sciences*, May.  
 H. K. HUNT. Population Problems of the Roman Republic [I]. *Hist. Stud., Australia and New Zealand*, Apr.

- FREDERIC M. WOOD, JR. The Military and Diplomatic Campaign of T. Quinctius Flaminus in 198 B. C. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, July.
- EMIL SADÉE. Die strategischen Zusammenhänge des Kimbernkriegs 101 v. Chr. vom Einbruch in Venetien bis zur Schlacht bei Vercellae. *Klio*, XXXIII, no. 3.
- HOMER H. DUBS. An Ancient Military Contact between Romans and Chinese. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, July.
- FRANZ WIEACKER. Privatrechtsgesetzgebung und politische Grundordnung im römischen Freistaat. *Antike*, XVI, no. 3.
- HENRY T. ROWELL. Vergil and the Forum of Augustus. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, July.
- H. I. BELL. Antinoöpolis: A Hadrianic Foundation. *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXX, no. 2.
- G. A. S. SNIJDER. Kaiser Hadrian und der Tempel des Venus und Roma. *Jahrb. Deut. Arch. Inst.*, LV.
- ALAN H. GARDINER. Adoption Extraordinary. *Jour. Egypt. Archaeol.*, XXVI.
- LOUIS C. WEST. The Roman Gold Standard and the Ancient Sources. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, July.

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL ARTICLES

- HJALMAR LARSEN. Tomb S19 at Maasara: An Egyptian Second Dynasty Tomb. *Acta Archaeologica*, XI, nos. 1-2.
- JOSEPH CARSON WAMPLER. Three Cistern Groups from Tell en-Nasbeh. *Bull. Am. School Oriental Research*, Apr.
- G. ERNEST WRIGHT. Solomon's Temple Resurrected. *Bibl. Archaeologist*, May.
- K. KÜBLER and K. GEBAUER. Ausgrabungen im Kerameikos. *Arch. Anzeiger*, 1940.
- VAGN HÄGER POULSEN. Myron: Ein stilkritischer Versuch. *Acta Archaeologica*, XI, nos. 1-2.
- B. SCHWEITZER. Pheidias, der Parthenonmeister. *Jahrb. Deut. Arch. Inst.*, LV.
- A. TSCHIRA. Die unfertigen Säulentrommeln auf der Akropolis von Athen. *Ibid.*
- G. RODENWALDT. Römische Reliefs: Vorstufen zur Spätantike. *Ibid.*
- KURT WEITZMANN. A Tabula Odysseaca. *Am. Jour. Archaeol.*, Apr.
- A. SCHULTEN. Forschungen in Spanien, 1933-39. *Arch. Anzeiger*, 1940.
- G. RODENWALDT. Ein lykisches Motiv. *Jahrb. Deut. Arch. Inst.*, LV.
- G. ROHDE. Ein neues Denkmal des Dolichenuskultes. *Arch. Anzeiger*, 1940.
- H. FUHRMANN. Archäologische Grabungen und Funde in Italien und Lybien. *Ibid.*
- K. BITTEL and A. M. SCHNEIDER. Archäologische Funde in der Türkei. *Ibid.*
- THE EDITORS. Roman Britain in 1939. *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXX, no. 2.

## LITERARY, INSCRIPTIONAL, AND PAPYROLOGICAL SOURCES

- H. E. WINLOCK. Neb-Hepet-Rē' Mentu-Hotpe of the Eleventh Dynasty. *Jour. Egypt. Archaeol.*, XXVI.
- W. F. ALBRIGHT. Two Letters from Ugarit (Ras Shamrah). *Bull. Am. School Oriental Research*, Apr.
- Id.* Ostrakon no. 6043 from Ezion-Geber. *Ibid.*
- NELSON GLUECK. Ostraca from Elath. *Ibid.*
- C. C. TORREY. The Seal from the Reign of Ahaz Again. *Ibid.*
- W. F. ALBRIGHT. The Lachish Letters after Five Years. *Ibid.*
- GÜNTHER JACHMANN. Ein Kapitel des Thukydides. *Klio*, XXX, no. 3.
- DONALD W. PRAKKE. A Note on the Megarian Historian Diocuchidas. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, July.
- W. KENDRICK PRITCHETT. Note on the Priests of Asklepios. *Ibid.*
- A. M. HONEYMAN. Observations on a Phoenician Inscription of Ptolemaic Date. *Jour. Egypt. Archaeol.*, XXVI.
- RICHARD A. PARKER. A Late Demotic Gardening Agreement. *Ibid.*
- F. M. HEICHELHEIM. The Text of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* and the Three Other Decrees of the Emperor Caracalla contained in Papyrus Gissensis 40. *Ibid.*
- A. SEGRÉ. P. Yale Inv. 1528 and P. Fouad. 21. *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXX, no. 2.
- SIR HERBERT THOMPSON. Two Demotic Self-Dedications. *Jour. Egypt. Archaeol.*, XXVI.
- A. SEGRÉ. On the Date and Circumstances of the Prefect's Letter: P. Oxy. 2106. *Ibid.*
- JEANNE ROBERT. Inscriptions de Carie. *Rev. Philol.*, N. S., XIV, nos. 3-4.
- J. M. R. CORMACK. A Letter of Hadrian in Beroea. *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXX, no. 2.

## MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Gray C. Boyce

*Saints Cyril and Methodius, Apostles of the Slavs.* By Reverend CYRIL J. POTOČEK. With Preface by Rt. Rev. Stanislaus F. Gmuc and Foreword by George Was-  
kovich. (New York, P. J. Kenedy, 1941, pp. 172, \$2.00.) Reverend Cyril J. Potoček has written a good summary of the ninth century apostles, the brothers Cyril (baptized as Constantine) and Methodius. His narrative is based principally on the Pannonian legends, the only extensive source on the missionaries. The first discussion deals with the authorship of these legends, and the conclusion is presented, after examining the works of the leading authorities, that the life of the saintly brothers was written by Clement, a disciple of Methodius, about the year 900. Secondly, in the author's opinion, the brothers, born in Solun, Macedonia, were in all likelihood of Slavonic blood; at least they were intimately acquainted with Slavonic manners and speech. It was their firsthand knowledge of the ways of the Slavs that qualified these men for missionary work outside the borders of the Byzantine Empire—among the Bulgars, the Moravians, the Khazars of the Crimea, and the Russians of Kiev. While on their mission the brothers translated the Scriptures into Slavonic and thus formulated the Cyrillic alphabet, which is still one of the three alphabets used by the present-day Slavs. Such are the high spots of the book. No new material is offered, nor has an attempt been made to delve into the Greek sources on this subject, which have been virtually untouched by American historians. Nevertheless, the four appendixes enhance the book's value. They are (1) Pope Benedict XV's prayer for reunion of East and West, (2) hymns from the Feast of Ss. Cyril and Methodius, (3) a discussion of the authorship of the Glagolitic and Cyrillic alphabets, and (4) an English translation of the Mass in the Byzantine-Slavonic liturgy. The bibliography is small but useful.

STEPHEN G. CHACONAS.

*Pravda russkaya* [Russian justice]. Volume I, *Teksty* [texts]. Compiled by V. P. LYUBIMOV and others. Edited by B. D. GREKOV. (Moscow, Izdat, Akademii nauk SSSR, 1940, pp. 505, 30.50 r.) The present work is issued under the auspices of the Institute of History, attached to the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. When completed it will be a most elaborate critical edition of a historicojuridical monument of first importance. Volume I offers a study on the manuscripts of *Pravda* and their classification from the pen of Professor Lyubimov as well as a transcript of fifteen variants of the document and "combined texts" (*svodnyye teksty*) of the shorter and longer version; there is also a most thorough index. A sequel is planned, which will contain facsimile reproductions of the manuscripts printed in the opening volume, and a third volume, devoted to commentaries, is also promised.

AVRAHM YARMOLINSKY.

*Progress of Medieval and Renaissance Studies in the United States and Canada.* Bulletin No. 16. By S. HARRISON THOMSON. (Boulder, University of Colorado, 1941, pp. 132, 50 cents.) The present Bulletin is by far the most extensive and useful to appear since this project was first started. It is in every way a tribute to the learning, vigor, and enthusiasm that Professor Thomson has brought to his task, and all scholars interested in medieval and Renaissance studies owe him a debt of gratitude. It is his foresight and determination to overcome difficulties that stood in the way which explain the continued publication of what is now an indispensable tool for historians and scholars in many other fields of learning. This number of the Bulletin contains the customary list of scholars and their publications; dissertations completed and in progress are also indi-

cated, papers read at learned societies noted, books in press announced, and items of special interest given proper attention. A significant contribution is the publication of four essays. Professor James L. Cate writes informingly, with wit, common sense, and engaging humor, on "A Decade of American Publication on Medieval Economic History"; Dr. Revilo P. Oliver surveys American writings on the Italian Renaissance; and Professor Thomson himself contributes two valuable essays: "Editing of Medieval Latin Texts in America" and "A Cross-Section of Medieval and Renaissance Holdings in American Libraries". *Floreat libellus*.

GENERAL ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS

- HANS KUHN. König und Volk in der germanischen Bekehrungsgeschichte. *Zeitsch. f. Deut. Altertum u. Deut. Lit.*, LXXVII, no. 1.  
A Late Saxon Hanging-Bowl. *Antiquaries Jour.*, Apr.  
The Temple Pyx. *Ibid.*  
T. D. KENDRICK. The Viking Taste in Pre-Conquest England. *Antiquity*, June.  
Persistence of Viking Types of Sword. *Antiquaries Jour.*, Apr.  
ANTHONY R. WAGNER. A Seal of Strongbow in the Huntington Library. *Ibid.*  
J. WARD PERKINS. The Iron Age Horseshoe [medieval materials]. *Ibid.*  
ARTURO CASTIGLIONI. The Origin and Development of the Anatomical Theater to the End of the Renaissance. *Ciba Symposia*, May.  
H. KÜRY and H. HAIG. Medical Education at Oxford and Cambridge. *Ibid.*, June.  
ROBERT A. HALL, JR. The Silk Factory in Chrestien de Troyes' *Yvain*. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, June.  
GEORGE L. HASKINS. The University of Oxford and the 'Ius Ubique Docendi'. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Apr.  
F. M. POWICKE. The Murder of Henry Clement and the Pirates of Lundy Island. *History*, Mar.  
FRITZ RÖRIG. Volkskunde. Hanse, und materialistische Geschichtsschreibung. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, CLXIII, no. 3.  
HEKTOR AMMANN. Zur Geschichte der Westschweiz in savoyischer Zeit. *Zeitsch. f. Schweiz. Gesch.*, XXI, no. 1.  
HELEN RICHARDSON. The Affair of the Lepers. *Medium Aevum*, Feb.  
REGNAR KNUDSEN. Danmarks befrielse og Niels Ebbesens eftermæle. *Gads Dan. Mag.*, Mar.  
ANSCAR PARSONS. Bernardine of Feltre and the *Montes Pietatis*. *Franciscan Stud.*, N. S., I, no. 1 (Mar.).  
R. SOMERVILLE. Duchy of Lancaster Presentations, 1399-1485. *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, Nov.  
OTON BERKOPEC. Die Anfänge des Buchdruckes bei den Südslaven. *Slav. Rundschau*, XII, nos. 1-2.  
A. V. FLOROVSKIJ. Die Anfänge des Buchdruckes bei den Ostslaven. *Ibid.*  
A. ČÍSAROVÁ-KOLÁŘOVÁ. Die Anfänge des Buchdruckes in Böhmen und Mähren. *Ibid.*

ECCLESIASTICAL

- WILLIAM J. MCGARRY. A Fundamental Principle in Mariology [cont.]. *Theolog. Stud.*, Dec.  
CLARENCE McAULIFFE. The Mind of Saint Pacianus on the Efficacy of the Episcopal Absolution [cont.]. *Ibid.*  
WILFRED PARSONS. The Influence of Romans XIII on Pre-Augustinian Christian Thought. *Ibid.*  
W. ROBINSON. Historical Survey of the Church's Treatment of New Converts with Reference to Pre- and Post-Baptismal Instruction. *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, Apr.  
G. H. JOYCE. Private Penance in the Early Church. *Ibid.*  
A. SOUTER. Notes on Incidental Gospel Quotations in Jerome's Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel. *Ibid.*  
FERDINANDO BERNINI. Innocenzo IV e il suo parentado. *N. Riv. Stor.*, June, 1940.  
GEROLD FUSSENEGGER. Ein Rundschreiben des Ordensgenerals Bonagratia an die österreichischen Provinz (1282). *Franziskan. Studien*, XXVII, no. 2.  
JOSEPH STANG. The Mediaeval Tirae of the Popes. *Eccles. Rev.*, July.

## ISLAM AND THE ORIENT

- SAMUEL S. HAAS. The "Creation of Man" in the Qur'ān. *Moslem World*, July.  
 W. R. TAYLOR. Syriac Manuscripts found in Peking, 1925 [Nestorian liturgy]. *Jour. Am. Oriental Soc.*, June.  
 HARUN KHAN SHERWANI. A Muslim Political Thinker of the Ninth Century A. D., Ibnī Abī'r-Rabī. *Islamic Culture*, Apr.

## INTELLECTUAL

- WILLIAM R. DORAN. Saint Thomas and the Evolution of Man. *Theolog. Stud.*, Dec.  
 GROVER CRONIN. The Bestiary and the Mediaeval Mind—Some Complexities. *Mod. Lang. Quar.*, June.  
 MARTINO GRABMANN. Sigieri di Brabante e Dante. *Riv. Filos. Neo-scolast.*, May, 1940.  
 TOMMASO LECCISOTTI. Il dottore angelico a Montecassino. *Ibid.*, Nov.  
 HUBERT NEUFELD. Zum Problem des Verhältnisses der theologischen Summe Alberts des Grossen zur theologischen Summe Alexanders von Hales. *Franziskan. Studien*, XXVII, no. 1.  
 J. KLEIN. Zur Busslehre des seligen Johannes Duns Skotus: Bemerkungen zu dem Buche von Krauting: Die Grundlagen der Busslehre des Johannes Duns Skotus [cont.]. *Ibid.*, no. 2.  
 MAURICE GRAJEWSKI. Scotistic Bibliography of the Last Decade, 1929-1939 [cont.]. *Franciscan Stud.*, N. S., 1, no. 1 (Mar.).  
 PHILOTHEUS BOEHNER. The *Centiloquium* attributed to Ockham [cont.]. *Ibid.*  
 EUGENIO ANAGNINE. Il concetto del Rinascimento attraverso la storia (iii-xiv sec.). *N. Riv. Stor.*, Oct., 1940.  
 EUGENIO GARIN. Recenti interpretazioni di Marsilio Ficino. *Gior. Crit. Filos. Ital.*, Dec.

## LITERARY

- JOHN J. PARRY. A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for the Year 1940. *Mod. Lang. Quar.*, June.  
 B. J. TIMMER. Wyrd in Anglo-Saxon Prose and Poetry. *Neophilologus*, XXVI, no. 3.  
 R. EKBLOM. Der Volksname *Osti* in Alfreds des Grossen Orosius-Uebersetzung. *Studia Neophilologica*, XIII, no. 3.  
 P. A. BECKER. Vom Kurzlied zum Epos. *Zeitsch. f. Französ. Sprache u. Lit.*, LXIII, nos. 7-8.  
 Id. Ogier von Dänemark. *Ibid.*, LXIV, nos. 1-2.  
 HERMENEGILDO CORBATÓ. La sinonimia y la unidad del "Poema del Cid". *Hispanic Rev.*, July.  
 W. A. NITZE. "Or est venuz aui aunera": A Medieval Dictum. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, June.  
 CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON. Old French *Assiet*. *Ibid.*  
 A. H. KRAPPE. An Oriental Theme in the *Friðþjófs* Saga. *Ibid.*  
 KURT LEWENT. Observations on Old Provençal Style and Vocabulary. *Mod. Lang. Quar.*, June.  
 CARIN FAHLIN. Les sources et la date du roman du Comte de Poitiers. *Studia Neophilologica*, XIII, no. 3.  
 ALFONSO RICOLFI. Ancora di due strane miniature di Francesco da Barberino (il "trionfo d'Amore" e la "corte d'Amore") e di una interpretazione settaria del Valli. *N. Riv. Stor.*, Apr., 1940.  
 S. H. STEINBERG. The *Forma Scribendi* of Hugo Spechtshart. *Library*, Mar.  
 GEORGE SANDERLIN. The Character "Liberum Arbitrium" in the C-Text of *Piers Plowman*. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, June.  
 A. G. MITCHELL. A Newly-Discovered Manuscript of the C-Text of 'Piers Plowman'. *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, Apr.  
 R. M. WILSON. Some Lost Saints' Lives in Old and Middle English. *Ibid.*  
 ERNST A. PHILIPPSON. *Der Ackermann aus Böhmen*: A Summary of Recent Research and an Appreciation. *Mod. Lang. Quar.*, June.  
 EDWARD B. HAM. An Eighth *Venjançe Alixandre*. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, June.  
 MARIE DALMER. Lexikologisches aus dem XV. Jahrhundert: Der Wortschatz Pierre Michault's. *Zeitsch. f. Französ. Sprache u. Lit.*, LXIV, nos. 1-2.

## MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

BRITISH EMPIRE

F. H. Herrick

*Observations upon a Late Libel, called "A Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend, concerning the King's Declaration, &c."* Edited with an Introduction and Bibliography by HUGH MACDONALD. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. 51, \$1.00.) Students of seventeenth century England will welcome this reprint of a pamphlet written just after the dissolution of the Oxford parliament, at the height of the excitement over the Exclusion contest. Mr. Macdonald, author of a bibliography of Dryden's writings and an expert on the period, has rescued a significant political tract from virtual oblivion. Furthermore, he has proved, to the satisfaction of this reviewer at least, that the *Observations upon a Late Libel* was written by George Savile, marquis of Halifax. Few investigators have uncovered anything about Halifax not already included in Miss Foxcroft's excellent *Life*, but Mr. Macdonald seems to have done so. A manuscript ascription to "ye E. of Hallifax" written in a contemporary hand on the title page of a copy in the Trinity College library suggested the possibility. A little research showed that Halifax could well have written it; and the internal evidence is so strong that the editor's verdict will presumably be accepted. Written in the simple and trenchant style which marks all of Halifax's known writings, it is enlivened by constant flashes of the wit for which he was famous, and there are frequent examples of certain archaisms which he is known to have affected; so that "if he did not write it", as the editor remarks, "he must have had a literary double". For the rest, the *Observations* is an extremely effective bit of polemics, written from that moderate Tory standpoint which "The Trimmer" adopted during the Exclusion contest; and if it interests few for that reason alone, it will interest many more who find Halifax not only the most attractive political figure of the Restoration but also a real master of English prose.

ROBERT WALCOTT, JR.

*The Treaty of Washington, 1871: A Study in Imperial History.* By GOLDWIN SMITH, of the Department of History in the State University of Iowa. (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1941, pp. xiii, 134, \$2.00.) If for the title of this monograph the subtitle had been selected, a more accurate description of its contents would have been given, for it does not contain an account of the Treaty of Washington. Indeed the real reason for assembling the Joint High Commission, at least in the opinion of most contemporaries, is dismissed with a few passing remarks, and the bulk of the work discusses the adjustment between the Dominion of Canada and Great Britain—the contest between Sir John A. Macdonald and his fellow commissioners over what Canada would do to facilitate a general cleaning up of Anglo-American disputes. The fisheries controversy is dealt with at length as a matter of consideration for the commission, a subject of acrimonious discussion in the Dominion and, finally, Sir John's decision to support the issue in parliament. The other Canadian-American disputes and their settlement are dismissed almost as summarily as the *Alabama* Claims. As a study of Canada's struggle for definitive status in the empire this work has merit. The concluding statement has been amply demonstrated: the commission "often unawares . . . moved Great Britain and British policy towards the time when the Imperial Parliament bestowed upon the Dominions 'an authority as plenary and as ample as the Imperial Parliament, in the plenitude of its powers, possessed and could bestow'". The principal weaknesses of the study lie in the two introductory chapters on "Canada and Canadian Questions" and "Great



Britain and the United States". Here occur many loose assertions which, if read by one who does not know the background, are likely to give a quite erroneous idea of what actually was done and thought.

L. B. SHIPPEE.

*Some Recollections of Claude Goldsmid Montefiore, 1858-1938.* By LUCY COHEN. With a Foreword by the Right Hon. H. A. L. Fisher. (London, Faber and Faber, 1940, pp. 277, 12s. 6d.) A man of fine intellectual attainment and spiritual integrity but with little personal glamor and few dramatic incidents in life, Claude G. Montefiore is not an attractive subject for a biography. Miss Lucy Cohen, a lifelong friend, realized this when she decided to describe his career, largely on the basis of her personal recollections and of the numerous letters which she received from Montefiore over a period of many years. She has given us a somewhat lifeless portrait, drawn with friendly admiration rather than historical discernment. Nevertheless, one gets glimpses of an unusually austere character, one of the few "saints" of our civilization who, living a rather conventional life, was quite unconventional in his views on religion. Professing a deep love for early Christianity, he represented a minority of one in British, indeed in World, Jewry. Conscious of his spiritual isolation, which by no means prevented him from playing the active role of a philanthropist, social worker, and, to a certain extent, leader of the liberal synagogue, he unflinchingly, though half-resignedly, adhered to his early views. He was a lifelong enemy of Zionism, holding it largely responsible for the spread of modern anti-Semitism, which embittered the last years of his life. Nonetheless, he firmly believed that "the Jews, please God, will never be absorbed. God has chosen them for a religious purpose in the History of the World, and till the earth is filled with the knowledge of the One God—the God of Israel—the Jews will be his witnesses. I should collapse morally and *spiritually* if I did not believe that" (pp. 217 f.). These occasional glimpses, shedding some new light on Montefiore's large literary output, render this biography worthwhile reading. It is supplemented by a bibliography of Montefiore's writings prepared by the Rev. V. G. Simmons and by a genealogical tree going back to Moses Vita Montefiore (1712-89).

SALO W. BARON.

*Report of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association, 1939-1940.* (Ottawa, the Association, 1941, pp. 103, 113.) This work includes the following papers: "The Windham or 'Oak Ridges' Settlement of French Royalist Refugees in York County, Upper Canada, 1798", by Brother Alfred; "Glengarry's Representatives in the Legislative Assembly of Upper Canada", Part II, by W. L. Scott; "English-speaking Priests who evangelized the Eastern Townships", by Gladys Mullins; "Pioneer English Catholics in the Eastern Townships", by T. J. Walsh; "Canadian Catholic Chaplains in the Great War, 1914-1918", by J. R. O'Gorman; "The Very Reverend J. R. Teefy, C. S. B., LL. D.", by Henry Carr; "Le conflit religieux au lendemain de 1760", by Lionel Groulx; "Le problème voltairien", by Séraphin Marion; "Le problème protestant", by Arthur Maheux; "Le mouvement démocratique", by Maurice O'Bready; "Le mouvement mennaisien au Canada français (1830-50)", by Michel Couture; "Le rôle de l'église dans les cantons de l'est", by Élie-J. Auclair; "États mystiques chez les convertis Indiens dans la Nouvelle-France", by Léon Pouliot.

#### ARTICLES

DAVID B. QUINN. The Early Interpretation of Poynings' Law, 1494-1534. *Irish Hist. Stud.*, Mar.

G. A. HAYES-McCOY. Strategy and Tactics in Irish Warfare, 1593-1601. *Ibid.*

GERHARD KITTEL. Die Wurzeln des englischen Erwählungsglaubens. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, CLXIII, no. 1.

- DOUGLAS BUSIL. Two Roads to Truth: Science and Religion in the Early Seventeenth Century. *E L H*, June.
- C. L. BERRY. Henry Tilson, Bishop of Elphin, and his Ministry during the Suppression of the Church. *Church Quar. Rev.*, Apr., June.
- J. C. BECKETT. The Government and the Church of Ireland under William III and Anne. *Irish Hist. Stud.*, Mar.
- E. S. DE BEER. The Early History of London Street Lighting. *History*, Mar.
- C. L. MARIWALLA. Karachi, 1700-1840. *Jour. Indian Hist.*, Dec.
- A. SRIVASTAVA. Was the Abdali Invasion of 1766-67 a Real Menace to Bengal? A Reply to a Rejoinder. *Ibid.*
- R. C. ANDERSON. The Ancestry of the Eighteenth Century Frigate. *Mariner's Mirror*, Apr.
- LOUIS J. MARTZ. Smollett and the Expedition to Cartagena. *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, June.
- W. M. PARKER. Rodney and his Naval Physician. *Army Quar.*, Apr.
- G. RUTHERFORD. The Capture of the *Ardent*. *Mariner's Mirror*, Apr.
- J. C. BEAGLEHOLE. The Colonial Office, 1782-1854. *Hist. Stud., Australia and New Zealand*, Apr.
- T. G. P. SPEAR. The British Administration of the Delhi Territory (1803-57). *Jour. Indian Hist.*, Dec.
- C. R. FAY. The Growth of the New Empire, 1783-1870. *Ec. Jour.*, Apr.
- W. P. MORRELL. The Second British Empire, 1783-1870. *History*, Mar.
- GEORGE W. SPRAGGE. John Strachan's Contribution to Education, 1800-1823. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, June.
- HOMIE N. FAIRCCHILD. Romanticism and the Religious Revival in England. *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, June.
- E. J. B. FOXGROFT. The New South Wales Aborigines' Protectorate, Port Phillip District, 1838-50 [II]. *Hist. Stud., Australia and New Zealand*, Apr.
- D. C. MASTERS. TORONTO *vs.* MONTREAL: The Struggle for Financial Hegemony, 1860-1875. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, June.
- G. A. BALLARD. British Gunvessels of 1875: The Smaller Twin-Screw Type. *Mariner's Mirror*, Apr.
- WILLARD E. IRELAND. Early Flour Mills in British Columbia [I]. *Brit. Col. Hist. Quar.*, Apr.
- JOHN ILMARI KOLEHMAINEN. Harmony Island: A Finnish Utopian Venture in British Columbia, 1901-1905. *Ibid.*
- RANSOME T. WYATT. The Bishop Thomas Library, Goulburn, New South Wales. *Hist. Stud., Australia and New Zealand*, Apr.
- JAMES G. ALLEN. Historical Development of the Governor-Generalship of South Africa. *Univ. Colorado Stud., Social Sciences*, May.
- H. S. MAZET. The Truth of the *Hampshire* Affair: The Tragedy which took Lord Kitchener 25 Years Ago. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.*, June.
- VISCOUNT CALDECOTE. The King's Prerogative. *Cambridge Law Jour.*, VII, no. 3.
- CUTHBERT HEADLAM. Party Politics. *Quar. Rev.*, Apr.
- R. H. GRAVESON. The Movement from Status to Contract. *Mod. Law Rev.*, Apr.
- HERBERT G. TELSEY. English Apportionment of Blame in Collisions at Sea. *Tulane Law Rev.*, June.
- JAMES K. POLLOCK. British By-Elections between the Wars. *Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.*, June.
- G. P. GOOCH. British Foreign Policy, 1919-39: VII, England and Germany, 1936-8. *Contemp. Rev.*, Apr.
- Id.* British Foreign Policy, 1919-39: VIII, After Munich. *Ibid.*, May.
- W. IVOR JENNINGS. Parliament in Wartime [IV]. *Pol. Quar.*, Jan., Mar.
- I. D. BLAIR. Wartime Problems of English Agriculture. *Agricultural Hist.*, Jan.
- JULIAN S. HUXLEY. The Growth of a Group Mind in Britain. *Yale Rev.*, Summer.
- E. J. COHN. Commercial Arbitration and the Rules of Law. *Univ. Toronto Law Jour.*, Lent.
- J. MERVYN JONES. Status of the Home Guard in International Law. *Law Quar. Rev.*, Apr.
- ARCHIBALD WAVELL. The Higher Commander. *Jour. Roy. United Service Inst.*, Feb.
- EARL WINTERTON. The Mobilization of the British Commonwealth. *Quar. Rev.*, Apr.
- DONALD COWIE. The Dominions at War: Active Phase. *Army Quar.*, Apr.
- Survey of Canadian Legislation [1940]. *Univ. Toronto Law Jour.*, Lent.
- P. E. CORBETT. Canada in the Western Hemisphere. *For. Affairs*, July.

- R. B. McDOWELL. Writings on Irish History, 1939. *Irish Hist. Stud.*, Mar.  
 IRISH CORRESPONDENT. Inside Ireland, 1939-1941. *Fortnightly*, May.  
 B. SHIVA RAO. The Vicious Circle in India. *For. Affairs*, July.  
 Social Problems on the Northern Rhodesian Copper Belt. *Internat. Labour Rev.*, May.

## DOCUMENTS

- W. POWELL JONES. Fortifying the Bermudas in 1801. *Huntington Library Quar.*, July.  
*Id.* New Light on Fulton's Submarine. *Ibid.*  
 JOHN PERRY PRITCHETT and MURRAY HOROWITZ. Five "Selkirk" Letters. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, June.  
 W. KAYE LAMB. Memoirs and Documents relating to Judge Begbie. *Brit. Col. Hist. Quar.*, Apr.  
 CLARENCE L. ANDREWS. Some Notes on the Yukon by Stewart Menzies. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, Apr.  
 STAFF OFFICER OF A DIVISION. A Diary of Events in France and Belgium: September, 1939-May, 1940. *Army Quar.*, Apr.

## FRANCE, BELGIUM, AND THE NETHERLANDS

## C. W. Cole

*Un voyageur-philosophe au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle: L'abbé Jean-Bernard Le Blanc.* By HÉLÈNE MONOD-CASSIDY. [Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1941, pp. xiii, 565, \$5.00.) The Abbé Le Blanc was a minor French writer of the eighteenth century who became known because of his literary journeys to England, Italy, and Germany. The book under review consists of a collection of his letters dealing chiefly with literary matters, prefaced by a long biographical and critical essay. The letters display neither learning nor style nor profound observation. The author quotes with approval the judgment of Le Blanc by the contemporary critic, Fréron. "Il est pédant dans sa prose, lourd dans ses réflexions, fécond en pensées communes, un peu trivial dans son érudition parfois déplacée." Nevertheless, Le Blanc merits the solid and learned volume devoted to him by Hélène Monod-Cassidy for the reason that he contributed not a little to the intellectual intimacy that existed between England and France during the eighteenth century. He helped to popularize English thought in France by praising Shakespeare, Milton, Locke, and Shaftesbury. He became an ardent admirer of Hume, whose *Essays* he translated into French. As a result of his travels in England, Le Blanc, in 1745, wrote his most important book, *Lettres d'un François concernant le gouvernement, la politique, et les mœurs des Anglois et des François*. It had a great vogue in France and was read by those who did not relish the anticlerical spirit of the more famous *Lettres philosophiques* of Voltaire. Le Blanc's book does not reveal him as an Anglophile, as was Voltaire. In general he was rather critical of English customs, politics, and literature, but his criticism was in the spirit of a friendly visitor and admirer. What is especially valuable in Hélène Monod-Cassidy's book is the excellent introductory essay and the eleven closely printed pages of bibliography on Anglo-French intellectual relations during the eighteenth century.

J. SALWYN SCHAPIRO.

*Vashington, ou la liberté du nouveau monde: Tragédie en quatre actes par Billardon de Sauvigny.* Edited with an Introduction and Notes by GILBERT CHINARD, with the assistance of H. M. BARNES, JR., J.-JACQUES DEMOREST, R. K. KELLENBERGER, and E. E. E. SAROT. [Princeton Publications in Romance Languages.] (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1941, pp. xli, 75, \$3.50.) This tragedy was presented at a turbulent moment during the French Revolution (July, 1791), and, since it contains elements of propaganda, it is important as a

reflection of public opinion. The plot, covering random episodes in the American Revolution, is merely incidental to *tirades* and tableaux glorifying the ideals of the American cause and the civic virtues of the patriots, all of which are symbolized in the towering figure of General Washington. At the same time Sauvigny naïvely transfers French local color to the American scene and endows the soldiers with the "couleur morale" of the sans-culottes. A session of Congress is a thinly disguised séance of the Assemblée nationale, and at Washington's camp the troops swear allegiance on the "autel de la patrie", an idea obviously borrowed from a celebration on the Champ de Mars a few months before the play appeared. Professor Chinard has prepared a splendid edition of the tragedy, adding a lengthy introduction and notes which clarify obscure passages in the text and separate fiction from fact. For example, he traces the identity of Lincol and Macdal to the minor revolutionists, General Benjamin Lincoln and Alexander MacDougal; and he corrects Sauvigny's inaccuracies as to time and place of action. The historian may not be impressed by the play's literary curiosities, but he will find that "la tragédie de *Vashington* a au moins un intérêt documentaire et historique de premier ordre".

KENNETH N. McKEE.

#### ARTICLES

HENRY J. CADBURY. Spinoza and a Quaker Document of 1657. *Med. and Ren. Stud.*, I, no. 1.

JACQUES BARZUN. Romantic Historiography as a Political Force in France. *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, June.

PIERRE COT. The Defeat of the French Air Force. *For. Affairs*, July.

LOUISE BOURGOIN. French Life under the Germans. *Yale Rev.*, Summer.

#### NORTHERN EUROPE

##### *O. J. Falnes*

*Klaus Fleming und der finnische Adel in den Anfangsphasen der Krise der neunziger Jahre des 16. Jahrhunderts.* By PENTTI RENVALL. (Turku, Uuden Auran Osakeyhtiön Kirjapaino, 1939, pp. xi, 377.) In the common history of Sweden and Finland, which extends over more than six centuries, the closing decades of the 1500's were exceptionally important in many ways. The new national monarchy of Gustavus Vasa had been founded in the 1520's and seemingly securely established by 1560, when the energetic founder of the house of Vasa died. Yet defects of rulers, religious problems, the question of succession, the dynastic connection between Sweden and Poland, conflicts between king and council, the shifting interests and objectives of the higher nobility, war with Russia—these rendered the developments of the next generation and more conspicuously turbulent. Upon the outcome of these troublesome years many things depended. Not the least important was the laying of the foundations of the strong monarchy under Gustavus Adolphus, which raised Sweden to the status of a European power. Dr. Renvall contributes an exceptionally detailed and able description of the part played by Klaus Fleming in the drama to the year 1594 and of the stand of the Finnish nobility toward King Sigismund, on the one hand, and Duke Charles, on the other. The survey is based on thorough archival studies; in the bibliography manuscript materials alone, found in various archives in Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, Estonia, and Danzig, cover well over three pages. It is the impression of the present reviewer that the story told in the seven lengthy chapters of the book will be considered definitive on the subject. It brings out in all possible clarity that despite the existence of fundamentally different and at times conflicting approaches to the domestic and

foreign problems of the day, Fleming and his fellow nobles in Finland found themselves in a position of common opposition to Duke Charles. The conflict was resolved only when Charles had successfully challenged the crown and severed the unhappy connection between Sweden and Poland.

JOHN H. WUORINEN.

*Social and Economic Aspects of Swedish Population Movements, 1750-1933.* By DOROTHY SWAINE THOMAS. [Institute for Social Sciences, Stockholm University, and Institute of Human Relations, Yale University.] (New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. 487, \$6.00.)

*I chose Denmark.* By FRANCIS HACKETT. (New York, Doubleday, Doran, 1940, pp. 291, \$2.50.)

*Finland Forever.* By HUDSON STRODE. (New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1941, pp. xix, 443, \$3.50.)

*With the Foreign Legion at Narvik.* By PIERRE O. LAPIE. Translated by ANTHONY MERRY. (London, John Murray; New York, Transatlantic Arts, 1941, pp. 157, 5s., \$1.50.)

*In the Norwegian Trap: The Battle for and in Norwegian Waters.* By RONALD SCARFE. (London, Francis Aldor, 1940, pp. 157, 2s.) This account, uniformly tendentious in tone, is undocumented. That is unfortunate, for one would like to know the authority for the account of a conference of Nazi leaders at the time of the Graf Spee sinking to consider an invasion of Scandinavia.

#### ARTICLES

HENRY J. CADBURY. Christopher Meidel and the First Norwegian Contacts with Quakerism. *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, Jan.

JULIUS CLAUSEN. Louise Danner: Psykologisk streiflys paa grundlag af utrykte kilder. *Guds Dan. Mag.*, Apr.

ARNE BERGSGÅRD. Statsrådssaka i hennar fyrste fase. *Hist. Tids.* (Nor.), 1941, no. 1. Agreement regarding Greenland [text somewhat abbreviated]. *Am. Scand. Rev.*, June. Economic Destruction of Denmark. *Ibid.*

OSCAR J. FALNES. Medieval Hansa and Modern Nazi: Two Periods of German Domination in Norway. *Ibid.*

#### GERMANY, SWITZERLAND, AND HUNGARY

E. N. Anderson

1848: *Chapters of German History.* By VEIT VALENTIN. Translated by ETHEL TALBOT SCHEFFAUER. (New York, Norton, 1940, pp. 480, \$3.75.) Every student of German history in the nineteenth century knows that Veit Valentin's *Geschichte der deutschen Revolution von 1848-49* (2 vols., 1930-33) is the authoritative work on the German revolution of 1848 and on the Frankfurt Parliament, which Dr. Valentin has styled the only German parliament "worthy of the name". When the second volume was published in 1933 (see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVIII, 549-51), a number of reviewers suggested that the work be translated into English. This has now been done. The present volume, it is true, is a condensation, but it contains all the essential ideas of the original; in fact, the elimination of many thousands of words has set in relief the main outlines of the story, which, in the German edition, are buried under a mountain of verbiage. The task of translating Dr. Valentin's German with its modern vocabulary was no simple one. This task the translator has performed in a creditable manner. While preserving much of the quality of the original German she has produced a clear and readable narrative. One might point out a few minor mistransla-

tions, but they are so rare that they should not be permitted to detract from the general excellence of the translation as a whole. This volume serves a distinct need and will undoubtedly receive a hearty welcome from those who have no acquaintance with German or who found the German original difficult.

ROBERT ERGANG.

*The German Army.* By HERBERT ROSINSKI. (New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1940, pp. 267, \$3.00.) No better critical introduction to the modern German army has come to the notice of this reviewer than this thoughtful volume, though it may be true that it is more useful to the historian than to the student of the present war. Mr. Rosinski, already well known through his penetrating study of Clausewitz and his articles on naval strategy published in *Brassey's Naval Annual*, writes with the expert's full knowledge of the evolution of German strategical theory and military organization. His chapters on the history of military theory and organization from Scharnhorst and Clausewitz through the elder Moltke and Count Schlieffen to General von Seeckt and the *Reichswehr* are precise, scholarly, and will repay close perusal. Yet the purpose of the book is a limited one, its central theme being neither the history of strategy nor organization but rather the changing position of the army within the framework of modern German society. Mr. Rosinski's discussion of the relation between the army and the civil government, of the fluctuations in the relationship between the general staff and the army commanders, of the broadening social base from which commissioned and noncommissioned officers were chosen, of matters of training and education, betrays a thorough and critical mastery of the entire pertinent literature. Most illuminating of all are those sections which deal with the reorganization of the *Reichswehr* by General von Seeckt and the progressive surrender of the almost autonomous *Reichswehr* to the Nazi leaders after the purge of 1934. Unhappily, the book, which first appeared in England in the autumn of 1939, just after the outbreak of the war, was republished in America in the spring of 1940 without the alterations which events required. Even so close a student of recent history as Rosinski was proved utterly mistaken by the events of the spring of 1940.

WALTER L. DORN.

#### ARTICLES

- AUGUST JEGEL. Der Humanist Vinzenz Heidecker, gen. Opsopocus. *Arch. f. Kulturgesch.*, XXX, nos. 1-2.
- HAROLD S. BENDER. Conrad Grebel as a Zwinglian, 1522-1523. *Mennonite Quar. Rev.*, Apr.
- GUSTAV AUBIN. Bartolomäus Viatis: Ein Nürnberger Grosskaufmann vor dem Dreissig-jährigen Kriege. *Vierteljahrsch. f. Sozial- u. Wirtschaftsgesch.*, XXXIII, no. 3.
- RAYMOND KLIBANSKY. Leibniz's Unknown Correspondence with English Scholars and Men of Letters. *Med. and Ren. Stud.*, I, no. 1.
- JOSEF MATL. Steirisch-südslawische Beziehungen im frühen steirischen Buchwesen. *Deut. Arch. f. Landes- u. Volksforsch.*, IV, nos. 3-4.
- ANNELIESE KRENZLIN. Probleme der neueren nordostdeutschen und ostmitteldeutschen Flurformenforschung. *Ibid.*
- KARL HEINZ PFEFFER. Zur Erforschung des Australiendeutschtums. *Ibid.*
- ERICH FRANZ SOMMER. Die Russlanddeutschen im Wandel des gesamtdeutschen Schicksals. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, CLXIII, no. 3.
- HERMANN WENDORF. Die Considérations sur l'état présent du corps politique de l'Europe: Friedrichs des Grossen erster Versuch in der Aussenpolitik. *Ibid.*
- GOETZ A. BRIEFS. The Economic Philosophy of Romanticism. *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, June.
- EUGENE N. ANDERSON. German Romanticism as an Ideology of Cultural Crisis. *Ibid.*
- KURT BORRIES. Das Weltbild und Lebensgefühl der Romantik. *Welt als Gesch.*, VI, no. 5.
- FRITZ SUDHAUS. Deutschland und die Auswanderung nach Brasilien im 19. Jahrhundert. *Deut. Arch. f. Landes- u. Volksforsch.*, IV, nos. 3-4.

- FRITZ KLAUS MARTINY. Über die Hauptzüge der niederösterreichischen Adelsgeschichte in den letzten Jahrhunderten. *Ibid.*
- FRITZ L. COHN. The Controversy over Becher's "Deutscher Rhein" (1840). *Mod. Lang. Forum*, Mar.
- WILHELM TREUE. Zur Gründungsgeschichte des Norddeutschen Lloyd. *Vierteljahrsch. f. Sozial- u. Wirtschaftsgesch.*, XXXIII, no. 3.
- BENNO V. WIESE. Das Tragische in Hebbels Welt- und Kunstanschauung. *Dichtung u. Volkstum*, XLI, no. 1.
- JACQUES BARDOUX. Les étapes de la montée prussienne. *Rev. Deux Mondes*, Apr. 15.
- MARCEL E. COMPAGNON. Le duel et la mort de Ferdinand Lassalle. *Zeitsch. f. Schweiz. Gesch.*, XXI, no. 1.
- RUDOLF PECHEL. Burckhardt oder Nietzsche? *Deut. Rundschau*, May.
- WALTHER REHM. Jacob Burckhardts Mitarbeit am Konversationslexikon von Brockhaus. *Arch. f. Kulturgesch.*, XXX, nos. 1-2.
- RICHARD MÖLLER. Noch einmal Bismarcks Bündnisangebot an England vom Januar, 1889. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, CLXIII, no. 1.
- WILHELM SCHÜSSLER. Noch einmal Bismarck zwischen England und Russland, 1889. *Ibid.*, CLXIII, no. 3.
- HANS HENNECKE. Sprache, Gedanke, und Lyrik im Lebenswerke Gerhart Hauptmanns. *Neue Rundschau*, Apr.
- PAUL APPEL. Der Romantiker Franz Marc. *Ibid.*
- TAYLOR COLE. National Socialism and the German Labor Courts. *Jour. Politics*, May.
- FRITZ KARSEN. On the Nazi Philosophy of Education. *Ger. Quar.*, May.
- FREDERIC STRAUSS. The Food Problem in the German War Economy. *Quar. Jour. Ec.*, May.
- ERIC VOEGELIN. Some Problems of German Hegemony. *Jour. Politics*, May.
- HANS REUTTER. Geopolitik Mährens. *Zeitsch. Deut. Vereins f. Gesch. Mährens u. Schlesiens*, XLII, no. 3.
- Id.* Mähren und das Reich. *Ibid.*, XLIII, no. 1.
- ZSOMBOR SZÁSZ. Hungarians—Rumanians. *Hung. Quar.*, Winter.
- HENRY MILLER MADDEN. Transylvania: A Subnation. *Ibid.*
- FRANCIS KÁSZONYI. Racial Problems in Transylvania. *Ibid.*
- ANTHONY SZERB. Captain John Smith in Transylvania. *Ibid.*
- GÉZA NAGY. The Reformed Church of Transylvania. *Ibid.*
- MARIE LOUISE THOMÉ. Madjarisierungsansätze in der protestantischen Gemeinde Kriegsdorf im Komitat Szilagy. *Deut. Arch. f. Landes- u. Volksforsch.*, IV, nos. 3-4.
- FRANZ BASCH. Deutsche Volksforschung in Ungarn. *Ibid.*
- LOUIS C. CORNISH. A Part of Transylvania comes Back. *Hung. Quar.*, Winter.
- OSKAR VASELLA. Die Entstehung der bündnerischen Bauernartikel vom 25. Juni, 1526. *Zeitsch. f. Schweiz. Gesch.*, XXI, no. 1.
- HEKTOR ANIMAN. Zur Geschichte der Westschweiz in savoyischer Zeit. *Ibid.*

## DOCUMENTS

- MANFRED KREBS. Die Rechtfertigungsschriften der vorderösterreichischen Städte vom Jahre 1526: Dokumente zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges am Oberrhein. *Zeitsch. f. Gesch. Oberrheins*, XCIII (N. S. LIV), nos. 1-2.
- WALTER GOETZ. Der Briefwechsel Gustav Schmollers mit Lujo Brentano [cont.]. *Arch. f. Kulturgesch.*, XXX, nos. 1-2.
- CARL-GUSTAF THOMASSON. Bismarck och Lord Randolph Churchill: Mötet i Bad Kissingen i textkritisk belysning. *Hist. Tids. (Sw.)*, 1941, no. 1.

## ITALY

*Gaudens Megaro*

## ARTICLES

- THEODOR E. MOMMSEN. Football in Renaissance Florence. *Yale Univ. Library Gazette*, July.
- H. L. O. GARRETT. An Italian in India: Paolo Di Avitabile. *Asiatic Rev.*, Apr.



- MARCEL GRILLI. The Nationality of Philosophy and Bertrando Spaventa. *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, June.
- DOROTHY HOSMER. Rhodes and Italy's Aegean Islands. *National Geograph. Mag.*, Apr.
- A. S. ELWELL-SUTTON. The Problem of the Adriatic. *Contemp. Rev.*, May.
- GIUSEPPE LO VERDE. Italien, 1925-1940. *Berl. Monatsh.*, Mar.
- BRUNO BRUNELLO. Forme ed esigenze dello stato totalitario. *Archivio Cultura Ital.*, Dec.
- RENÉ DE VISMÉ WILLIAMSON. The Fascist Concept of Representation. *Jour. Politics*, Feb.
- Italian Labor under War Conditions. *Monthly Labor Rev.*, May.
- ERNST KLEIN. Drang nach dem Süden. *Fortnightly*, May.
- C. M. FRANZERO. Italy under the Nazi Heel. *Free Europe*, May 16.
- RENATO POGGIOLI. Italian Literature in Exile. *Decision*, June.
- LUIGI STURZO. The Future of Italy. *Free Europe*, June 27.
- SIR CHARLES GWYNN. The Future of Italian East Africa. *Fortnightly*, June.

## RUSSIA AND POLAND

Avrahm Yarmolinsky

*Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya v epokhu imperializma: Dokumenty iz arkhivov tzarskovo i vremennovo pravitel'stv, 1878-1917. Seriya vtoraya, 1900-1913* [international relations in the epoch of imperialism: documents from the archives of the imperial and provisional governments. Series 2, 1900-13]. Volume XX, Part 2. Compiled by L. A. TELESHEVA and others. (Moscow, Gos. izdat. polit. literatury, 1940, pp. 520, 12 r.) This latest addition to the series of volumes issued by the Soviet commission for the publication of the documents of the imperialistic epoch covers the period from August 14 to October 17, 1912. The subjects treated include the Balkan crisis and the Italo-Turkish War. The volume is provided with indexes of names, correspondents, and subjects as well as with a reproduction of a chart of the Balkans illustrating a project for the partition of the peninsula entertained in 1912 by Austria-Hungary.

## ARTICLES

- A. P. SMIRNOV. Ocherki po istorii volzhskikh bulgar [studies in the history of Volga Bulgars]. *Trudy Gos. istoricheskogo muzeya*, XI (1940).
- Id.* Ocherk drevnei istorii Mordvy [sketch of the ancient history of Mordva]. *Ibid.*
- S. A. TARAKANOVA. Ob arkheologicheskom izuchenii sel'skikh feodal'nykh poselenii v pyatinakh Velikovo Novgoroda [archaeological study of the rural feudal settlements in the province of Novgorod]. *Ibid.*
- L. V. CHEREPNIN. Iz istorii drevnerusskikh feodal'nykh otnoshenii xiv-xvi vv. [contribution to the history of feudal relations in Russia, 14th-16th centuries]. *Istoricheskie zapiski*, 9 (1940).
- V. P. LYUBIMOV. Smerd i kholop [peasant and serf in old Russia]. *Ibid.*, 10 (1941).
- M. N. TIKHOMIROV. Maloizvestnye letopisnye pamyatniki xvi v. [little-known annals of the 16th century]. *Ibid.*
- S. B. VESELOVSKI. Monastyrskoe zemlevladienie v Moskovskoi Rusi vo vtoroi polovine xvi v. [monastic land ownership in Muscovy in the second half of the 16th century]. *Ibid.*
- P. A. SADIKOV. Moskovskie prikazy, "chetverti", vo vremena oprichniny [the higher administrative offices, *chety*, in the time of Ivan the Terrible]. *Ibid.*
- S. V. BAKHRUSHIN. Voenno-promyshlennye ekspeditsii torgovykh lyudei v Sibiri v xvii v. [military-trading expeditions of Russian merchants to Siberia in the 17th century]. *Ibid.*
- S. K. BOGOYAVLENSKI. Khovanshchina [mutiny of the strel'tzi in 1682]. *Ibid.*
- S. YA. BOROVOL. Natsional'no-osvoboditel'naya bor'ba ukrainskogo naroda protiv pol'skovo vladychestva i yevreiskoe naselenie Ukrainy [struggle for the national liberation of the Ukrainian people from Polish domination and the Jewish population]. *Ibid.*, 9.

- T. K. KRYLOVA. Russko-turetzkiye otnosheniya vo vremya Severnoi voïny [Russo-Turkish relations during the Northern war]. *Ibid.*, 10.
- K. V. SIVKOV. Byudzhët krupnovo sobstvennika—krepostnika pervoi treti xix v. [budget of a large Russian landowner of the first third of the 19th century]. *Ibid.*, 9.
- V. I. PISAREV. Metody zavoyevaniya adygeiskovo naroda tzarizmom v pervoi polovine xix v. [methods of conquest of the Adyghe (Circassian) people in the first half of the 19th century]. *Ibid.*
- A. L. POPOV. Iz istorii zavoyevaniya Srednei Azii [contribution to the history of the conquest of Central Asia]. *Ibid.*
- BRUCE C. HOPPER. Narkomindel and Comintern: Instruments of World Revolution. *For. Affairs*, July.

## FAR EASTERN HISTORY

C. H. Peake

*The Chinese Way in Medicine*. By EDWARD H. HUME. [Publications of the Institute of the History of Medicine, the Hideyo Noguchi Lectures.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1940, pp. 189, \$2.25.) In this little book the general reader will find an interesting, popularized description of Chinese native medical practices and beliefs, though the scholar will find it uncritical, adding little to such works as the *History of Chinese Medicine* of K. C. Wong and Wu Lien-têh. The first lecture is devoted to a discussion of the place of the medical and allied sciences in the Chinese theories of the composition and mechanics of the universe. In the second lecture the author gives an account of the "founders" of Chinese medicine and biographies of certain eminent practitioners. In the final lecture, "Some Distinctive Contributions of Chinese Medicine", medical libraries and monographs, medicaments, physical therapy, and diagnostic methods are described. The author has not been careful in his use of certain data or in his romanization. For example: page 15, Lao Tzû is accepted as a historical figure, and his authorship of the Tao Tê Ching is unquestioned, and on page 47 he is accepted as the founder of Taoism; page 21, first mention of Ko Hung, Chinese characters first given on page 41, wrongly romanized as Koh Hung on page 39; page 46, *hu p'oh* should be *hu p'o* (no characters given), and *joo-i* should be *ju-i*. The book is attractively printed and illustrated. F. D. SCHULTHEIS.

*A Selected List of Books and Articles on Japan in English, French, and German*. Compiled by HUGH BORTON, SERGE ELISSÉEFF, and EDWIN O. REISCHAUER. (Washington, Committee on Japanese Studies, American Council of Learned Societies, 1940, pp. x, 142, \$1.50.) It is a pleasure to welcome this useful list of books and articles on Japan. The compilers state in their preface that their object is to provide a convenient guide for classroom work and for libraries with limited collections. No attempt has been made to compete with the more extensive bibliographies of Wenckstern, Nachod, *et al.* The compilation lists some 842 works, and the subject headings range from bibliographies and reference works through geography, history, economics, government and politics, sociology, mythology, religion, and philosophy to language, literature, and art. In one or two respects this admirable compilation might be improved. It would have been of service to small colleges and libraries to indicate where in the United States some of the books and periodicals published in Japan or in Europe might be purchased. Moreover, many of the articles listed, while excellent, appear in periodicals which few of the smaller institutions are likely to have. These are forced by economic necessity to rely on such inadequate general works as those of Murdoch, Brinkley, Griffis, and Gowen for the bulk of their student assignments. Adequate files of the best journals in the field are out of the question for

the smaller institutions. In this respect many of the articles cited will no doubt cause wishful sighs on the part of many who teach courses having to do with Japan, but it will not cause library committees to assign funds sufficient to purchase the more esoteric periodicals frequently cited. With these minor reservations the bibliography will form an excellent guide both for teaching and study and for the guidance of those institutions that are attempting in their purchases to steer their way through the mountains of books on Japan now available.

THOMAS E. LA FARGUE.

#### ARTICLES

- R. T. OLOV JANSE. An Archaeological Expedition to Indo-China and the Philippines. *Harvard Jour. Asiatic Stud.*, June.
- A. W. HUMMEL. The Development of the Book in China. *Jour. Am. Oriental Soc.*, June.
- M. MORI. On the State Control of Popular Ceremonial Rites under the Ch'in and the Han Dynasties [in Japanese]. *Tôhō Gakuhō*, Apr., 1940.
- CH'EN CHUNG-MIEN. Examples from Stone Inscriptions illustrating the Errors and Obscurities of History [in Chinese]. *Bull. Inst. Hist. and Philol. Acad. Sinica*, Vol. VIII, Part 4 (1939).
- CH'UAN HAN-SHENG. External and Internal Trade of Canton during the Sung Dynasty [in Chinese]. *Ibid.*, Part 3 (1939).
- K. KIMURA. On the Study of the "Pen-tsao", the Chinese Materia Medica [in Japanese]. *Tôhō Gakuhō*, Jan., 1940.
- PAUL K. BENEDICT. A Cham Colony on the Island of Hainan. *Harvard Jour. Asiatic Stud.*, June.
- MATTHIAS EDER. Der Untergang des Hauses Cheng. *Monumenta Serica*, V (1940).
- RUDOLF LÖWENTHAL. Jews in China: An Annotated Bibliography. *Chinese Soc. and Pol. Sci. Rev.*, Sept., 1940.
- WALTER FUCHS. Koreanische Quellen zur Frühgeschichte des Tabaks in der Mandjuri zwischen 1630 und 1640. *Monumenta Serica*, V (1940).
- HENRI BERNARD. Ferdinand Verbiest: Continuateur de l'oeuvre scientifique d'Adam Schall. *Ibid.*
- CH'EN CHUNG-SIU. China in the English Literature of the Seventeenth Century. *Quar. Bull. Chinese Bibliog.* (Eng. ed.), Dec.
- LEWIS A. MAVERICK. Pierre Poivre: Eighteenth Century Explorer of Southeast Asia. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, June.
- J. DEHERGNE. Les origines du christianisme dans l'île de Hainan. *Monumenta Serica*, V (1940).
- J. K. FAIRBANK and S. Y. TENG. On the Ch'ing Tributary System. *Harvard Jour. Asiatic Stud.*, June.
- H. MIKUNIYA. Grant's Mediation concerning the Subjection of the Loochoo Islands [in Japanese]. *Tôhō Gakuhō*, Oct., 1939.
- KENNETH PERRY LONDON. The Problem of the Chinese in Thailand. *Pacific Affairs*, June.
- JOHN L. CHRISTIAN. Trans-Burma Trade Routes to China. *Ibid.*
- CHITOSHI YANAGA. The Military and the Government in Japan. *Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.*, June.

#### UNITED STATES HISTORY

E. C. Burnett

#### GENERAL

*Constitutional Chaff: Rejected Suggestions of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, with Explanatory Argument.* Compiled by JANE BUTZNER from the Notes of JAMES MADISON of Virginia, Major WILLIAM PIERCE of Georgia, Dr. JAMES MCHENRY of Maryland, RUFUS KING of Massachusetts, and the Honorable ROBERT YATES of New York. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. 197, \$2.25.) The excellent title of this book perfectly describes its contents. Article by article, section by section, and sometimes clause by clause the Con-

stitution of the United States is taken up. Plans suggested in the Federal Convention that might have replaced or modified the several provisions of the document are presented with the arguments in their favor. These things are seldom quoted from the records exactly. They are paraphrased "to make a compendium of ideas" that were not adopted. It must have been an interesting piece of work for the compiler, and it is printed for those who enjoy speculating on what might have been, "in other words . . . those who read for the best possible reason—entertainment".

MAX FARRAND.

*George Washington as the French knew him: A Collection of Texts.* Edited and translated with an Introduction by GILBERT CHINARD. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1940, pp. xviii, 161, \$2.50.) Estimates of Washington the man, the general, and the statesman are countless. They have been coming forth since the day he entered the first Congress of the colonies, and they are not likely to cease so long as the people of the United States are drawn to a study of their national beginnings. But these estimates are, for the most part, by Americans for Americans. It is fitting, therefore, that we should have brought together out of obscurity the expressions of Frenchmen who had known Washington personally or had had occasion to evaluate the man and his life-work. Nearly one half of this volume is occupied with reminiscences or other expressions of French officers who had been more or less closely associated with Washington during the war, among them, as a matter of course, Lafayette. The most extensive of such expressions, however, are drawn from the memoirs of the Marquis de Chastellux. Another group of extracts is from the letters and other writings of diplomats, travelers, and observers—fifteen in all—from Gérard, the first French minister, to Crèvecoeur. Especially noteworthy inclusions are the tribute paid to Washington by Napoleon when first consul (1797) and the funeral eulogy pronounced by Fontanes on February 8, 1800. Lastly there are tributes from "a later generation of admirers", notably Tocqueville and Guizot. In the view of the editor it is worthy of observation that before Mason L. Weems placed Washington on that lofty pedestal atop which he remained for a hundred years or more, Frenchmen were regarding him as one of the greatest figures in the history of the world. Nearly all the characterizations found here are, in fact, highly eulogistic. In assembling these otherwise all but inaccessible impressions and tributes Dr. Chinard has performed a valuable service.

*We hold These Truths: Documents of American Democracy.* Selected and edited with an Introductory Essay by STUART GERRY BROWN. (New York, Harper, 1941, pp. vi, 351, \$1.25.)

*The Federal System of the United States of America: A Study in Federal-State Relations.* By NARESH CHANDRA ROY, Professor of History and Political Science, City College, and Lecturer, Post-Graduate Department, Calcutta University. (Calcutta, University of Calcutta, 1940, pp. xii, 308.)

*Some Aspects of Jefferson Bibliography: A Paper read before the Bibliographical Society of America.* By WILLIAM H. PEDEN, Department of English, University of Maryland. (Lexington, Journalism Laboratory Press, Washington and Lee University, 1941, pp. 22, \$1.25.)

*The Lincoln Collection of the Illinois State Historical Library.* By PAUL M. ANGLE. (Springfield, the Library, 1940, pp. 21.)

*Camp Morton, 1861-1865: Indianapolis Prison Camp.* By HATTIE LOU WINSLOW and JOSEPH R. H. MOORE. [Indiana Historical Society Publications.] (Indian-

apolis, the Society, 1940, pp. 229-383, 75 cents.) The story of the Northern prison camps during the Civil War will probably never be fully told. While the present monograph acceptably fills the gap for Camp Morton, the reviewer cannot escape the feeling that there is much more that could be told. The treatment of prisoners of war is always a highly controversial topic, and honesty compels the admission that on this subject the South has received inadequate justice at the hands of historians. As a recent popular novel expressed it, "even as Andersonville was a name that stank in the North, so was Rock Island one to bring terror to the heart of any southerner who had relatives imprisoned there" (Mitchell, *Gone with the Wind*, pp. 285-86). And the same could be said with equal truth of Camps Morton, Chase, or Douglas, of Fort Delaware, Point Lookout, or any other of the Northern camps. The present study is, however, more than the history of a prison camp. It traces the history of Camp Morton from its organization as a training center for recruits through its transformation into a prison depot and then through the period of decline and extinction as the war came to an end. Instances abound of inefficiency, of stupidity, of political "wire-pulling", and of downright human meanness. The use of local records, such as the Indianapolis newspapers, adds to the value of the study. There are no serious errors of omission or commission. There is no bibliography apart from the voluminous footnotes, and in a publication of this sort a separate index is not to be expected. The study is well worth the attention of all interested in the subject of the Civil War and of "man's inhumanity to man".

EDGAR I. STEWART.

*The Thirteenth Amendment: A Milestone in Emancipation.* By CHARLES H. WESLEY, Professor of History, Howard University. (Washington, Graduate School, Howard University, 1940, pp. 23.)

*The Negro in our History.* By CARTER G. WOODSON. Seventh edition. (Washington, Associated Publishers, 1941, pp. xxx, 673, \$4.00.) "In revising this book the aim has been not so much to expand the volume as to modify and revise the treatment in the light of recent developments. New matter has been incorporated from chapter to chapter, but the aim has been to avoid amplification. Recent data on economic, educational, and religious matters have been inserted in many cases by substitution rather than by expansion."

*Engines of Democracy: Inventions and Society in Mature America.* By ROGER BURLINGAME. (New York, Scribner's, 1940, pp. xviii, 606, \$3.75.) This illustrated volume purports to be a record of technological development with emphasis upon its social background and consequences, especially its effect in unifying the nation. It covers, for the most part, the period of American history from 1865, when "the effective forces, technical and social, were all collective[ly] tending to tighten the complex". As the author says, he was forced to forego a strictly chronological treatment for another, "showing the inventions and technologies which developed under a wide variety of social impulses all moving more or less at once toward what seems to be a final cohesion". The book is not intended as a history of invention. The author disclaims technical expertness and endeavors to write in the layman's language—a practice which is apt to horrify the technical purist. The author naturally philosophizes about the circumstances of invention and the social order and sometimes seems to become entranced with his own verbosity. Mr. Burlingame makes a commendable plea for teaching our children more about such matters as Eli Whitney and his system of interchangeable parts, at the expense of the Webster-Hayne debate.

the Missouri Compromise, "or even Ben Franklin's everlasting kite tethered as it is by its spurious moral string to so many American school books".

RUSSELL H. ANDERSON.

*Victory, How Women won it: A Centennial Symposium, 1840-1940.* By the National American Woman Suffrage Association. (New York, Wilson, 1940, pp. 174, \$1.25.) This short summary of how women won the suffrage in the United States was written for distribution among the delegates to the Woman's Centennial Congress held in New York City on November 25-27, 1940. Like the congress, the book points more to past victories than to future solutions. Seven prominent feminists, chiefly veterans of the National American Woman Suffrage Association and untainted with the National Woman's Party virus, wrote the eleven chapters; they scan the main developments between 1820 and 1920. A foreword by Mrs. Catt, eight photographs of outstanding suffragists with thumbnail sketches of them, and an explanatory appendix (but no index) complete the book. Presumably pressure of affairs attendant on the congress helped to prevent such editorial labor as might have integrated the essays into a well-knit whole. However, several of these sketchy little narratives and the appendix have definite value, and that for three reasons. First, we cannot understand the course of legislation in the United States unless we get the story of the lobbies. Second, the survival of our republican form of government depends upon the degree to which considerations of public welfare animate both our lobbyists and the legislators upon whom they place the pressure. Third, the suffrage lobbies in Illinois during 1913, in New York during 1917, and in Washington in 1917-19 reached a height of efficiency which brilliantly illuminates feminine technique, especially in American political reform. Any budding lobbyist of either sex can well profit by rules herein demonstrated, particularly if he or she dares to urge some proposition for public welfare as against private interest. This achievement is doubtless enough for one small book, but it leaves two things greatly to be desired: an analysis of the interests opposing suffrage and a frank explanation of the schisms among the suffragists themselves. JEANNETTE P. NICHOLS.

*Labor in Wartime.* By JOHN STEUBEN. (New York, International Publishers, 1940, pp. 159, \$1.50.) This book is an account and appraisal of labor policy and labor conditions during the first World War. It has a strong left-wing bias. The author, consequently, holds Samuel Gompers and his associates responsible for destroying the peace faction in the labor movement and surrendering vital interests of the American Federation of Labor to the Wilson administration and American business. He quotes Louis Lorwin to the effect that Gompers succumbed to the flattery of Ralph M. Easley, secretary of the National Civic Federation, who played on his antisocialistic biases. It is his conclusion that, as a result of the federation's policies, "the conditions of workers were not improved during or after the war"; "outside of a few skilled crafts, unemployment remained a problem during the war years"; "organized labor lost in the field of labor legislation"; and "labor did not gain a greater degree of recognition". Mr. Steuben regards the current labor situation as a repetition of that of the last war. "Conditions in America today", he writes, "are remarkably similar . . . to those at the time of the first World War. . . . Then, as now, the United States was on the brink of assuming a new role in world affairs. Then, as now, the country passed gradually from neutrality to intense war preparations and finally to active participation in the war." "Gompers was appointed by the President to serve on this [Defense Advisory] Commission as a 'representative of labor', a position similar to that at present occupied by Sidney Hillman". The contrasts

in labor policy during the present and the last wars are, however, much more striking than the similarities, and whatever value this piece of work has lies in the recital of labor events in the years 1917 and 1918. LEO WOLMAN.

*The American Empire: A Study of the Outlying Territories of the United States.*

WILLIAM H. HAAS, Editor. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1940, pp. xi, 408, \$4.00.) Dr. Haas and his collaborators have undertaken in this volume an appraisal of the American empire. Taking our insular possessions, Alaska, and the Canal Zone seriatim, they give an altogether admirable summary of their history, geology, natural resources, social and economic problems, and prospects. The note of pessimism which predominates is, by general admission, well justified. The criticism of American colonial policy is scrupulously fair; it does not indulge in gratuitous condemnation and certainly does not award laurels. This is as it should be, for no conceivable change in the political status of our possessions would result in any fundamental change for the better in their social and economic status. On the contrary, the outlook for the Philippines under the Tydings-McDuffie Act portends possible disaster. In the judgment of these authors, only Alaska can be called a justifiable imperial venture. It would be difficult to provide a more honest appraisal of American imperialism than the final chapter of this book, contributed by Professors Haas and Cox. The conclusion to which the authors come is sound: that only on strategic grounds can our policy of overseas expansion be justified. But curiously enough it is in an examination of the strategic factors that the book is weakest. This is probably attributable to the notable lack of competence and interest in military and naval problems which has been typical of American social scientists. In general, the sins of this volume in respect to strategy are sins of omission. Nevertheless, there are occasional statements which are of doubtful validity. There are no maps and no bibliography—serious omissions in what purports to be a standard book of reference. On the other hand, there are pictures which add practically nothing to the value of the book. A subsequent edition might remedy these faults and add material on the new American naval and air bases. EDWARD MEAD EARLE.

*American Political and Social History.* By HAROLD UNDERWOOD FAULKNER, Smith College. Second edition. [Crofts American History Series, Dixon Ryan Fox, General Editor.] (New York, Crofts, 1941, pp. xxv, 804, \$3.75.) "In addition to some changes in the earlier parts of the book, the second edition includes a thorough revision of the material since 1920, the addition of a final chapter carrying the history through the opening months of the third Roosevelt administration, and an effort to bring the bibliographies up to date."

*We have a Future.* By NORMAN THOMAS. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1941, pp. viii, 236, \$2.50.) "This book has its origin in a desire to write simply and briefly about our country as it might be in contrast to what I fear it may become. It is a personal treatment of the questions involved, as seen against the background of more than twenty years of hard political work, including four Presidential campaigns and many other trips which have taken me into all parts of the country."

ARTICLES

CARLE C. ZIMMERMAN. The Evolution of the American Community. *Am. Jour. Sociol.*, May.

RICHARD H. SHRYOCK. Englische und deutsche Betriebsformen der Landwirtschaft: Eine Gegenüberstellung für die Kolonialzeit. *Deut. Arch. f. Landes- u. Volksforsch.*, IV, nos. 3-4.

FRANK DEAN GIFFORD. The Influence of the Clergy on American Politics from 1773 to 1776. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, June.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XLVII.—14



- JOHN JOSEPH GRAHAM. The Development of the Separation of Church and State in the United States of America [II]. *Rec. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.*, Mar., 1940.
- ROBERT KENT GOOCH. Jeffersonianism and the Third Term Issue: A Retrospect. *Southern Rev.*, Spring.
- NORVAL NEIL LUXON. H. Niles, the Man and the Editor. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, June.
- WILLIAM CHARVAT. Francis Jeffrey in America [1813-15]. *New Eng. Quar.*, June.
- JOHN F. CADY. The Religious Environment of Lincoln's Youth. *Indiana Mag. Hist.*, Mar.
- JOHN PERRY PRITCHETT. The Croasdale Painting of Lincoln. *Ibid.*
- CHARLES W. GILKEY. Lincoln's Philosophy of Life. *Abraham Lincoln Quar.*, June.
- LYLE H. WRIGHT. Famous Lincoln Collections: The Huntington Library. *Ibid.*
- WILLIAM H. DAVIS. "Old Ironsides" in Chancery. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.*, June.
- HENRY P. BEERS. Historical Sketch of the Office of the Judge Advocate General, Navy Department. *Ibid.*, May.
- ROBERT W. NEESER. Historic Ships of the Navy: *Montauk* [1862, 1917]. *Ibid.*
- FREDERICK LEWIS ALLEN, WILLIAM L. CHENERY, and FULTON OURSLER. American Magazines, 1741-1941. *Bull. New York Public Library*, June.
- ERNEST ELMO CALKINS. Amateur Journalism. *Ibid.*
- CALVIN T. RYAN. The American's Love of Being First. *South Atlantic Quar.*, Apr.
- DEXTER PERKINS. The Monroe Doctrine To-day. *Yale Rev.*, Summer.

## NEW ENGLAND AND MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

*The Delaware Loyalists.* By HAROLD BELL HANCOCK. [Papers of the Historical Society of Delaware.] (Wilmington, the Society, 1940, pp. xi, 76, paper \$1.00, cloth \$1.50.) Mr. Hancock has dug into the available records to discover whether Delaware was loyalist or patriotic in the Revolution and how much the one or the other. If anyone has conceived the notion that all Delaware spoke with the tongues of Caesar Rodney and Thomas McKean, this study is bound to banish that delusion. On the basis of the evidence assembled the author reaches the conclusion that "the great majority of the inhabitants were opposed to or indifferent to independence". Expressed in terms of percentages, one half of the people of Delaware were outright loyalists, 20 per cent were "pacifist and hesitant", whilst only 30 per cent were "patriotic". The case of Delaware is just one more proof that, in the earlier stages at least, the Revolution was the work of a militant minority. As for the classes who composed the loyalist ranks, Delaware, unlike most of the other colonies, had but few officials or politicians to contribute to the loyalist cause, and even the capitalist, commercial, and landed interests were not conspicuous for numbers. More numerous contributions were made by the professions—ministry, law, medicine, and teaching; still, all these classes taken together constituted but a fraction of the whole. The great majority of Delaware loyalists were "plain conservatives". Among the religious sects, only the Anglican Church was prevailingly loyalist. In its treatment of loyalists after the war, Delaware's record is, upon the whole, one of leniency. The proofreader nodded every now and then.

*John and William Bartram, Botanists and Explorers, 1699-1777, 1739-1823.* By ERNEST EARNST. [Pennsylvania Lives.] (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940, pp. vi, 187, \$2.00.) John and William Bartram, scientists, explorers, and writers of vivid prose, occupy a distinguished place in the development of American culture. The father, America's first botanist, received the tribute of the great Linnaeus; the son not only followed in his father's scientific footsteps but acquired literary renown as the author of *Travels through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida*, which supplied both Coleridge and Wordsworth with material. So famed were the botanical specimens of the elder Bartram that André Michaux and Peter Kalm journeyed to the shores of the Schuylkill to view them, and the younger Bartram's classifica-

tion of native birds long remained basic. Yet the historian of ideas is as much concerned with the Bartrams as men who mirrored their times as with the Bartrams as scientists and scholars. Mr. Earnest has filled a gap in the literature of early American thought. Notwithstanding the varied richness of their lives the Bartrams failed to stimulate the biographical drive among historians. Until this brief study—of especial significance because all available source material has been used—William Darlington's *Memorials* (1849) was the only account of John Bartram, while no adequate biography of William Bartram existed. If the biographical function is to present a sharply etched portrait of a life, this biography has fulfilled it. But if biography is the evaluation of a life history as the terminal point in a genetic series of events, this one fails fully to meet the requirement. While the book at once becomes the most authoritative secondary study of the Bartrams, many will wish that more attention had been given to the deeper underlying forces which helped to make the Bartrams great.

BERT JAMES LOFWENBERG.

*Joseph Tuckerman, Pioneer in American Social Work.* By DANIEL T. MCCOLGAN, Priest of the Archdiocese of Boston. (Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1940, pp. xx, 450, \$2.50.) This dissertation, presented for the degree of doctor of philosophy in social science in the Faculty of the School of Social Work of the Catholic University of America, treats in an interesting and exhaustive manner of much neglected and well-nigh forgotten literature of the social movement in the United States in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Tuckerman, in the brief fifteen years, 1826-40, of his Boston ministry-at-large in the American Unitarian Church, was a unique character and left his mark upon the foundation forces which created, a half century later, the beginnings of the structure of American social work as we know it today. It was rather in the field of religious social work and in the relation of the religious motive to organized social work in the vastly extended scope it was destined to cover that Tuckerman was a real pioneer. The sympathetic but also critical appraisal of the significance of Tuckerman's contribution to the religious controversies of a century and more ago by a Roman Catholic priest lends added value to Dr. McColgan's dissertation. One third of the text is given over to notes and bibliography, which are well organized and should prove valuable to social workers who wish to look back on the social work of other days so different from the present.

SAMUEL McCUNE LINDSAY.

*John Alfred Brashear, Scientist and Humanitarian, 1840-1920.* By HARRIET A. GAUL and RUBY EISEMAN. [Pennsylvania Lives.] (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940, pp. viii, 220, \$2.25.) This is a short, literary biography of John Alfred Brashear, Pittsburgh's beloved man of science, which describes the milieu in which he lived and worked. The authors absorbed many of the facts and much of the sentiment surrounding Brashear and his devoted and helpful wife, Phoebe, in order to orient themselves for their task. They trace his career from a humble home in Brownsville, Pennsylvania, to the mills of Pittsburgh and thence from the role of an uneducated mill hand to a position of eminence among scientists throughout the world, an unusual humanitarian scientist. He was best known in other lands for his construction of fine instruments, lenses, reflectors, and spectroscopes, which made possible great astronomical progress and discoveries at the beginning of the twentieth century. At home his activities in education and philanthropy, perhaps, did more to endear him to Pittsburghers than did his inventions. He was sought as a consultant by Pittsburgh's millionaires in shaping their cultural projects and as a result served as a trustee of the Western University of Pennsylvania (later the University of

Pittsburgh), of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, of the Frick Educational Commission, and of numerous other organizations and institutions. Wealthy manufacturers, apparently, respected the man for his unselfish contributions to humanity and his native, informal gentility and culture. He remained the unassuming vehicle through which they made many contributions. The authors have produced an intimate, popular account of their subject's life. Much of their information was gleaned from Brashear's own articles and autobiography and much from interviews with his former associates. The book is unencumbered with footnotes, has a good index, and an inadequate bibliography.

R. J. FERGUSON.

#### ARTICLES

- CHARLES IRELAND PETTINGELL. Walter Barefoote. *New Eng. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July.
- DOROTHY S. HAYES. To the Farthest Gulf: Outline of the Old China Trade, 1784-1844 [concl.]. *Essex Inst. Hist. Coll.*, July.
- WILMOND W. PARKER. Lympus and Lilliesville in 1855. *Proc. Vermont Hist. Soc.*, June.
- GIDEON STUDLEY. Industries in an Old Colony Village Eighty Years Ago. *New Eng. Quar.*, June.
- W. G. O'DONNELL. Race Relations in a New England Town. *Ibid.*
- JOHN C. KILEY. Changes in Realty Values in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries [Boston]. *Bull. Business Hist. Soc.*, June.
- WILLIAM J. HOFFMAN. Anthony Colve: The Last of the Dutch Governors of New Netherland. *New York Geneal. and Biog. Rec.*, July.
- GEORGE L. MCKAY. A Register of Artists, Booksellers, Printers, and Publishers in New York City, 1781-1800. *Bull. New York Public Library*, May, June.
- LORING McMILLEN. Staten Island Architecture [cont.]. *Staten Island Historian*, Apr.
- BEVERLY MCANEAR. James Parker *versus* John Holt [concl.]. *Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc.*, July.
- JOHN O. BIGELOW. New Jersey Constitutional Convention of 1844. *Ibid.*
- ROY F. NICHOLS. The Historical Society and the Two Commonwealths. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, July.
- FRANK J. KLINGBERG. The Anglican Minority in Colonial Pennsylvania, with Particular Reference to the Indian. *Ibid.*
- FREDERICK B. TOLLES. A Literary Quaker: John Smith of Burlington and Philadelphia. *Ibid.*
- BENNETT M. RICH. Washington and the Whiskey Insurrection. *Ibid.*
- CHARLES C. BRYCE. The Backwoodsman Era in Western Pennsylvania. *Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag.*, Mar.
- MERLE H. DEARDORFF. The Cornplanter Grant in Warren County. *Ibid.*
- M. FLAVIA TAYLOR. The Political and Civic Career of Henry Baldwin, 1799-1830. *Ibid.*
- GEORGE SEIBEL. Pittsburgh's Place in the Fourth Estate. *Ibid.*
- MARK OWEN HELLER. The Union Church Problem in Eastern Pennsylvania. *Lutheran Church Quar.*, Apr.

#### DOCUMENTS

- A. J. H. RICHARDSON. Chief Justice William Smith and the Haldimand Negotiations. *Proc. Vermont Hist. Soc.*, June.
- OSCAR ZEICHNER. Jeremy Belknap and the William Samuel Johnson Correspondence [1795-96]. *New Eng. Quar.*, June.
- ERNEST S. DODGE. An Early Letter to the Salem East India Marine Society [1802]. *Essex Inst. Hist. Coll.*, July.
- WALTER HERBERT STOWE. The Scabury Minutes of the New York Clergy Conventions of 1766 and 1767. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, June.
- Diary or Memorandum Book kept by Joseph Lewis of Morristown [1783-95]. *Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc.*, July.
- GERHARD FRIEDRICH. Pastorius' Naturalization Paper. *Bull. Friends' Hist. Assoc.*, Spring.
- FREDERIC R. KIRKLAND. Letter of John Laurens, November, 1777. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, July.
- MARIAN SADTLER HORNOR. A Washington Affair of Honor, 1779. *Ibid.*

## SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

*Three Virginia Frontiers.* By THOMAS PERKINS ABERNETHY, Richmond Alumni Professor of History, the University of Virginia. [The Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History, Louisiana State University.] (University, Louisiana State University Press, 1940, pp. xiii, 96, \$1.50.) This study in three parts, one each on "tidewater", "piedmont and the Valley", and "Kentucky", comprises the 1940 Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures delivered at Louisiana State University and is intended to be illustrative of stages of American frontier advance. To those who trace democracy largely to Jeffersonian influences it will come as a challenge, for its author goes a long way toward proving that some among them do not understand Jefferson's ideas and have frequently mistaken manifestations of Western self-interest for democracy. More informing still is his thesis to the effect that most of the social progress in these stages of our advance were products of liberal rather than of democratic leadership. By use of high spots in the conflict between frontier conditions and European backgrounds in the tidewater, the author shows how Virginia ended the seventeenth century, with its liberal beginnings, in a wave of reaction which tended to become stable. The society thus developed extended into central piedmont and was soon encircled by somewhat distinctive frontiers in the Valley and to the southwest. Nevertheless, according to Professor Abernethy, "the law and the necessity for leadership" were stronger there than was democracy. With undisguised allusions to a well-known school of historians whose thesis has, in the opinion of the present reviewer, been taken too literally, he asserts, furthermore, that "the westward movement did not roll forward with an orderly and irresistible force like the waves of the sea". Correctly, he shows it to have been an irregular and uncertain advance which conformed in the main to established traditions and customs. Although Kentucky was settled under conditions more favorable to the rule of numbers, there too "the entrenched interests were able to control the situation". Change was consequently a product of liberal rather than of democratic leadership.

C. H. AMBLER.

*William Byrd's Natural History of Virginia, or The Newly Discovered Eden.* Edited and translated from a German Version by RICHMOND CROOM BEATTY, Vanderbilt University, and WILLIAM J. MULLOY, University of California at Los Angeles. (Richmond, Dietz Press, 1940, pp. xxviii, 95, 109, \$4.00.) The publication of William Byrd's *Natural History of Virginia, or The Newly Discovered Eden* is an addition to Americana. It consists of an introduction by the editors, an English translation of a German version of the book, an appendix, and the original German text. It will be particularly valuable to historians, horticulturists, and zoologists interested in the physical conditions of Virginia and the flora and fauna of the colony during the early eighteenth century. As the editors explain, the original volume was published in German for the purpose of encouraging Swiss immigrants to settle in the colony and therefore includes information helpful to anyone interested in making Virginia his home. Many trees, flowers, animals, and fish are described in detail, particularly as to their practical uses. Equally as interesting and valuable as the book itself is the introduction by the editors, which is lucid and concise and written with a sense of humor worthy of Byrd, whose writings are characterized by a lightness of touch that has made them interesting reading after all the years which have elapsed. The introduction includes a short biography of William Byrd, the reasons for the writing of the *Natural History of Virginia, or The Newly Discovered Eden*, and high lights of life and times in Virginia in this period. The publication of a book of this nature is particularly important when more and

more emphasis is being given to the social side of history. It is therefore fitting that a clear picture of the natural conditions of the country and the wild life which was found there should be preserved and published in readable form. The general appearance of the volume is a credit to the Dietz Press.

JAMES L. COGAR.

*The Vestry Book of St. Paul's Parish, Hanover County, Virginia, 1706-1786.* Transcribed and edited by C. G. CHAMBERLAYNE. (Richmond, Library Board of Virginia, 1940, pp. xx, 672, \$5.00.) This volume is the sixth in a series making available in printed form the records of certain contiguous parishes in tidewater Virginia between the lower Rappahannock and the James, an area in which many of the early county archives have been lost. The manuscript book of St. Paul's Parish is in part a transcript of an earlier record. Special interest attaches to it because it is the only known Virginia vestry book which was used regularly as a register for recording land processioning orders and returns. The editor gives a helpful account of processioning and its enforcement in colonial Virginia. In the minutes of this parish one finds more than the average amount of material on the glebe and the church and chapel buildings. The very fact, however, that the record is concerned primarily with routine matters enhances its value for social history. The Reverend Patrick Henry, uncle of the Revolutionary leader, was minister for forty years. There is only one reference to the Revolutionary War (p. 532), but the spirit of the times may be reflected in the vestry's action in 1778, censuring certain parishioners for having advertised in the *Virginia Gazette* for a new minister when "this Vestry has by Law, the sole right of electing & presenting a Minister to this parish for Twelve Months next after a vacancy happens therein" (pp. 537-38). The volume contains a complete name and subject index. It is regrettable that Dr. Chamberlayne, the editor, who was preparing other parish records for publication in this series, died shortly before the book went to press.

LESTER J. CAPPON.

*The Road from Monticello: A Study of the Virginia Slavery Debate of 1832.* By JOSEPH CLARKE ROBERT, Assistant Professor of History, Duke University. [Historical Papers of the Trinity College Historical Society.] (Durham, Duke University Press, 1941, pp. ix, 127, \$1.00.) This is an excellently handled piece of research, demonstrating the prominent part played by this debate in creating subsequent Southern sentiment concerning slavery. The author has examined a very wide range of material covering every phase of the subject, but he has not felt obligated to display all that he has found, if only by sample. Instead he has done some masterful and successful condensation, compressing into fifty-six pages everything that is of permanent value in connection with the episode. His use of brief quotations is illuminating, but for those who want more he has selected typical extracts from the speeches that fill an appendix as long as the text. Still further, in showing the origins and the importance of this debate as a turning point in the history of Southern feeling, he has displayed an admirable objectivity, devoid of the Southern "revisionism" so fashionable of late and wholly unconcerned with the abolitionists, whose lack of connection with the episode he easily demonstrates. As a study of the crystallization of Virginia sentiment in both sections of the state it is a definitive analysis.

THEODORE CLARKE SMITH.

*Laws and Joint Resolutions of the Last Session of the Confederate Congress (November 7, 1864-March 18, 1865), together with the Secret Acts of Previous Congresses.* With an Introduction and a Bibliographical Note by CHARLES W. RAMSDELL, Editor. [Duke University Publications.] (Durham, Duke University Press, 1941, pp. xxvii, 183, \$2.50.) The statutes-at-large of the Confederate States

were published by the Confederate Department of Justice, with the exception of the enactments passed at the second and last session of the Second Congress, some of which received official newspaper publication. A few of the acts and resolutions of this session were available in the *Official Records* (Army and Navy series), and a complete list of the unpublished statutes was given in the January, 1936, number of this *Review*; but it has remained for Professor Ramsdell to supply their full text. He took as his starting point the "Register of Acts, C.S.A.," a manuscript book (now the property of Duke University), in which had been kept the official record of all enactments, secret and open, public and private, of the Confederate Congresses from their inception in February, 1861, to their end in March, 1865. The text of nearly half of the acts and resolutions was obtained from the Duke collection of enrolled originals, which had been assembled by the late Professor William Kenneth Boyd through the generosity of the family of George Washington Flowers. Professor Ramsdell uncovered and pieced together the text of the remaining enactments, principally from the *Official Records*, the *Journal of the Congress of the Confederate States*, material in the National Archives, and the Richmond newspapers. He also canvassed many other sources with such admirable patience and success that the text of only one of the acts of the final session and four of the secret acts escaped him. This contribution to the source literature of the Confederacy will be indispensable to the library of every student dealing with that phase of American history. The book is equipped with an excellent index, a facsimile of an enrolled act showing all official endorsements, a brief historical introduction, and a critical bibliography.

WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR.

*The South in Progress.* By KATHARINE DUPRE LUMPKIN. (New York, International Publishers, 1940, pp. viii, 256, \$2.50.) In its general character this volume is more of a sociological survey of the South in the 1930's than a systematic historical account of events. For her facts the author relies extensively on the writings of numerous Southern sociologists and economists, of whom T. J. Woofter, R. P. Vance, C. S. Johnson, Clarence Heer, H. W. Odum, George Mitchell, and C. W. Alexander are typical. But she has also gone to such sources as newspapers, magazines, journals of learned societies, and a host of government publications for much new and fresh material. Some "scientific" sociologists complain that Miss Lumpkin is entirely too partisan in her approach for her work to have more value than that which attaches to any special pleading. It is true that she makes no effort to conceal her sympathies. They are definitely on the side of the Negro, the share cropper, the factory worker—in short, with the underdog generally. Conversely, she has little or no sympathy with native or Yankee capitalists who exploit both Southern natural resources and human labor. The Southern "Bourbon" Democratic politicians who slavishly serve the exploiting classes in county, city, state, and nation are particularly pains in Miss Lumpkin's neck. Such complaints of the "detached" fact-finding sociological "scientists" leave this quite unscientific historian cold. He believes that the author's facts are sufficiently true to justify her sympathies. More power to her!

B. B. KENDRICK.

*The Poll Tax.* [Southern Conference for Human Welfare.] (Washington, American Council on Public Affairs, 1940, pp. 23, 25 cents.) "This survey is a . . . presentation of the case against the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in eight Southern states."

#### ARTICLES

Sister M. RIVA. Catholicism in Colonial Maryland. *Rec. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.*, Mar., 1940.  
JOSEPH T. WHEELER. Reading Interests of the Professional Classes in Colonial Maryland, 1700-1776. *Maryland Hist. Mag.*, June.



- CHARLES A. BARKER. The Revolutionary Impulse in Maryland. *Ibid.*  
 W. BIRD TERWILLIGER. William Goddard's Victory for Freedom of the Press. *Ibid.*  
 SIDNEY T. MATTHEWS. Control of the Baltimore Press during the Civil War. *Ibid.*  
 G. MACLAREN BRYDON. New Light upon the History of the Church in Colonial Virginia. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, June.  
 LYON G. TYLER. Bacon's Rebellion. *Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, July.  
 WILLIAM NEWALL DAVIS, JR. Frontier Fortifications along the Virginia Fall Line. *Ibid.*  
 C. E. HATCH, JR. Glassmaking in Virginia [I]. *William and Mary Coll. Quar. Hist. Mag.*, Apr.  
 GEORGE CARRINGTON MASON. The Colonial Churches of Norfolk County, Virginia. *Ibid.*  
 EDWARD A. WYATT, IV. Three Petersburg Theatres. *Ibid.*  
 W. B. MCGROARTY. Alexandria's Lancasterian Schools. *Ibid.*  
 FRANKLIN L. BURDETTE. A West Virginia Filibuster [1911]. *South Atlantic Quar.*, Apr.  
 EUGENE PERRY LINK. The Democratic Societies of the Carolinas. *North Carolina Hist. Rev.*, July.  
 DOROTHY MACKAY QUINN. Flora Macdonald in History. *Ibid.*  
 KENNETH EDSON ST. CLAIR. Debtor Relief in North Carolina during Reconstruction. *Ibid.*  
 FABIAN LINDEN. Notes on Some Prevailing Fallacies in Southern Ante-Bellum History. *Georgia Hist. Quar.*, June.  
 KENNETH COLEMAN. The Georgia Gubernatorial Election of 1880. *Ibid.*  
 WILLIAM BRYAN GATES. The Theatre in Natchez. *Jour. Miss. Hist.*, Apr.  
 JOHN SMITH KENDALL. The Successors of Lafitte. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, Apr.  
 KARL J. R. ARNDT. The Genesis of Germantown, Louisiana, or the Mysterious Past of Louisiana's Mystic, Count de Leon. *Ibid.*  
 HOWARD PALMER JOHNSON. New Orleans under General Butler. *Ibid.*  
 HISTORICAL RECORDS SURVEY, W. P. A. Guide to Depositories of Manuscript Collections in Louisiana. *Ibid.*

## DOCUMENTS

- DORIS MASLIN COHN. The Haynic Letters [1782-93]. *Maryland Hist. Mag.*, June.  
 JOHN PHILIPS CRANWELL. Shipbuilding on the Chesapeake: Recollections of Robert D. Lambdin. *Ibid.*  
 HOLMAN HAMILTON. Zachary Taylor in Mississippi. *Jour. Miss. Hist.*, Apr.  
 DAVID RANKIN BARBEE and MILLEDGE L. BONHAM, JR. Fort Sumter Again. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, June.  
 JAMES A. PADGETT. Reconstruction Letters from North Carolina [II]. *North Carolina Hist. Rev.*, July.

## WESTERN TERRITORIES AND STATES

*William Salter, Western Torchbearer.* By PHILIP D. JORDAN, Miami University. [Men of America Series, Volume I.] (Oxford, Mississippi Valley Press, 1939, pp. x, 273, \$3.00.) Out from orthodox little Andover Theological Seminary, in the autumn of 1843, went a small band of young preacher-missionaries to the Middle Western frontier. In imitation of the Yale band which went to Illinois, this group went to Iowa, to spread the teachings of Congregationalism in a land just being opened up but already occupied by "ignorant" Universalists and more emotional and adaptive Methodists and Baptists. One of these missionaries was William Salter, who, as Professor Jordan makes clear, by his more than sixty years of activity in Iowa became locally conspicuous as preacher, author, historian, and civic leader. The chapter entitled "Saddle Bags" is informing and shows that a Congregationalist could exhibit a zeal and activity worthy of a Methodist circuit rider. Salter saw Mormons as they were leaving Nauvoo for Utah. He labored against the odds of "indifference, intemperance, Mormonism, slavery and the spirit of conquest". He championed religion and refinement in Burlington, Iowa, and helped to found Iowa College, later Grinnell. The book, besides being the life story of a man, is a study of the growth of Iowa from early frontier "heathen" conditions to the great state of 1900, a study of immi-



gration from the East and from Europe, of the great cholera epidemic, of the reaction of this community to the Civil War and Reconstruction. Not the least value to be found in it is the picture it gives of the home life of a struggling missionary who became a prominent preacher. Salter's historical work attained recognition, and he delivered the prayer at the cornerstone laying of the Historical Building at Des Moines in 1899. Professor Jordan has given us a faithful record. It is well that history at times turns from supposedly larger national and sectional themes to the saga of the locality. H. C. HUBBART.

*Iowa, Land of Many Mills.* By JACOB A. SWISHER. [Iowa Centennial History.] (Iowa City, State Historical Society of Iowa, 1940, pp. 317, \$3.00.) The emphasis in the title of this attractive volume—appropriate for the series in which it appears—might suggest that Iowa has been peculiarly the land of mills. Dr. Swisher's narrative, however, connects Hawkeye enterprises with those in the older states and in the Old World. The mill as an institution marks an important stage in industrial progression. Unfortunately, whether from lack of adequate data or difficulty in exact classification, industrial and social historians have generally failed to indicate clearly and definitely the steps and influences in the transition from mill to factory and have tended to confuse, more or less, the "mill" as an organization of capital and labor and as a technical process. Regional studies of this sort may contribute to a more definite understanding. Dr. Swisher, however, is mainly interested in the social aspects of the subject—the mill in frontier life. Consequently his topical narratives tend to be somewhat episodic and antiquarian but nonetheless interesting and informing. Statistical tables in the notes and a list of identified mills by counties add to the book's informational value, as selected photographs do to its attractiveness. Literary allusions to the subject should certainly include Thomas Dunn English's sincere if sentimental "The Old Mill" and the tragic compression of social history in "The Mill" of Edwin Arlington Robinson. EARLE D. ROSS.

*Benjamin Franklin Shambaugh as Iowa remembers him, 1871-1940.* (Iowa City, State Historical Society of Iowa, 1941, pp. 229.) This volume commemorates a distinguished teacher who was the leading historian of his native state. The preface is signed by John Ely Briggs, Dr. Shambaugh's successor as editor of the State Historical Society of Iowa.

*Shoshonean Days: Recollections of a Residence of Five Years among the Indians of Southern California, 1885-1889.* By G. HAZEN SHINN. (Glendale, privately printed for the author by Arthur H. Clark, 1941, pp. 183, \$3.50.) In 1885 G. Hazen Shinn, age seventeen, arrived among the Shoshonean-speaking Cahuilla and Serrano Indians of southern California. His Recollections, written fifty years later, although consisting mainly of observations of Indian life and personal anecdotes during these "Shoshonean days", are filled with lengthy digressions devoted to sundry anthropological matters. Although the author observed the Cahuilla and Serrano only a generation after the mission period, when far less of their aboriginal culture had been lost than during the present century, anthropologists will not find the volume an important source for aboriginal ethnology of southern California. Not only does the lapse of fifty years before the observations were recorded leave them less authentic than might be desired, but statements of fact are secondary to long and often speculative discussions of the views of early and recent anthropological writers. Without, however, posing as a scientist or historian, the author contributes material of some interest on the creation myth of southern California tribes, on certain native boundaries of his two tribes, and a few scattered paragraphs describing Indian gambling, shamanism, dances, and several ceremonial prac-

tices. To an anthropologist far greater interest attaches to the status of Cahuilla and Serrano culture during the 1880's. From random accounts of events and personalities, written with a genuine sympathy for the natives, one gets the impression that much of native culture had ceased to function during this period and that not only had racial conflict set off the Indian from the white man—the sketch of the mestizo, José Miguel, is particularly revealing—but that the older and younger Indian generations differed on the question of assimilating European customs, a state of affairs that is very familiar to students of the modern Indians.

JULIAN H. STEWARD.

*Presbyterian Colleges and Academies in Nebraska.* By FRANK E. WEYER, Dean and Professor of Education, Hastings College, Hastings, Nebraska. (Hastings, privately printed, distributed by Hastings College Bookstore, 1940, pp. xi, 242, \$1.50.) The Presbyterians have established three colleges and two academies in Nebraska. Each of the five schools suffered at times from poor planning, inadequate leadership, and uncertain financial support. Eventually four of them closed their doors, but Hastings College continued and in the past two decades has experienced a rapid development. The educational motives of Presbyterianism in America generally, as well as in Nebraska, are adequately summarized in this study. Briefly, they were to prepare ministers, to perpetuate Christian principles, to promote democratic government and the general welfare of man, to co-operate with the public-school system, and to help preserve academic freedom. It would have been enlightening, however, if the author had made a more definite attempt to determine the measure in which these purposes have been achieved in the Presbyterian schools in Nebraska. A large part of the treatise analyzes the personnel, finances, and curricula of the former Bellevue College and the present Hastings College. The importance of having trustees with varied occupational backgrounds and the trends toward a better prepared faculty and a modern curriculum are significant aspects of the present growth of Hastings College. The searching analysis of the functions and growth of these two schools is presented with an accurate, factual background, making a useful monograph in educational trends of denominational colleges.

CHARLES J. KENNEDY.

*Michigan: A Guide to the Wolverine State.* Compiled by Workers of the Writers' Program of the Work Projects Administration in the State of Michigan. [American Guide Series.] (New York, Oxford University Press, 1941, pp. xxxvi, 682, \$3.00.)

*Wyoming: A Guide to its History, Highways, and People.* Compiled by Workers of the Writers' Program of the Work Projects Administration in the State of Wyoming. [American Guide Series.] (New York, Oxford University Press, 1941, pp. xxvii, 490, \$2.75.)

*The Wyoming Archaeological Survey.* A Report by TED C. SOWERS, State Supervisor, Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, State of Wyoming. (Laramie, University of Wyoming, 1941, pp. 31.)

#### ARTICLES

SAMUEL C. WILLIAMS. Colonel Elijah Clarke in the Tennessee Country. *Georgia Hist. Quar.*, June.

KENNETH W. MCKINLEY. Ohio, Prize of the Revolution. *Ohio State Archaeol. and Hist. Soc. Museum Echoes*, May.

WILLIAM D. OVERMAN. Select List of Materials on Ohio History in Serial Publications. *Ohio State Archaeol. and Hist. Quar.*, Apr.

GEORGE W. RIGHTMIRE. Ohio in McGuffey's Time. *Ibid.*

- RUSSEL B. NYE. Judge Tourg  c and Reconstruction. *Ibid.*
- ROGER A. HURST. The New Harmony Manuscript Collection. *Indiana Mag. Hist.*, Mar.
- H. S. K. BARTHOLOMEW. Thomas R. Marshall. *Ibid.*
- ARTHUR B. COZZENS. The Iron Industry of Missouri. *Missouri Hist. Rev.*, July.
- HOWARD I. MCKEE. The School Law of 1853: Its Origin and Authors. *Ibid.*
- PIERRE R. PORTER. Quality Hill: A Study in Heredity. *Ibid.*
- REX W. STRICKLAND. Miller County, Arkansas Territory: The Frontier that Men Forgot. *Chron. Oklahoma*, Mar.
- CLIFFORD H. PRATOR. LaSalle's Trip across Southern Michigan in 1680. *Michigan Hist. Mag.*, Spring.
- JOSEPH GREGORICH. Contributions of the Slovenes to the Chippewa and Ottawa Indian Missions. *Ibid.*
- GEORGE W. STARK. George Byron Catlin: The Story of a Rolling Stone. *Ibid.*
- JACK T. JOHNSON. John Chambers [governor of Iowa Territory, 1841]. *Palimpsest*, May.
- KENNETH E. COLTON. Iowa Pioneer Lawmakers' Association. *An. Iowa*, Apr.
- WRITERS' PROGRAM OF THE IOWA W. P. A. Baseball!! The Story of Iowa's Early Innings. *Ibid.*
- JOHN A. AMAN. Views of Three Iowa Newspapers on the League of Nations, 1919-1920. *Iowa Jour. Hist. and Pol.*, July.
- JAMES FREDERIC CLARKE. Reminiscences of the Agassiz Association in Iowa, with Special Reference to the Fairfield Chapter. *Ibid.*
- BERTHA L. HEILBRON. Frank B. Mayer and the Treaties of 1851. *Minnesota Hist.*, June.
- PHILIP D. JORDAN. The Hutchinson Family in the History of American Music. *Ibid.*
- CHARLES W. NICHOL. New Light on the Northampton Colony. *Ibid.*
- JOHN T. FLANAGAN. Hamlin Garland, Occasional Minnesotan. *Ibid.*
- CORA DOLBEE. The Fourth of July in Early Kansas, 1854-1857. *Kansas Hist. Quar.*, Feb.
- G. RAYMOND GAEDDEBT. First Newspapers in Kansas Counties, 1854-1864. *Ibid.*
- T. M. LILLARD. Beginnings of the Kansas Judiciary. *Ibid.*
- A. T. HILL and MARVIN KIVETT. Woodland-like Manifestations in Nebraska. *Nebraska Hist.*, July, 1940.
- CHARLES ARTHUR HAWLEY. Whittier and Nebraska. *Bull. Friends' Hist. Assoc.*, Spring.
- LYNN I. PERRIGO. Law and Order in Early Colorado Mining Camps. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, June.
- COLIN B. GOODYKOONTZ. The Progressive Movement in Colorado, 1910-1912. *Univ. Colorado Stud., Social Sciences*, May.
- W. TURRENTINE JACKSON. The Washburn-Doane Expedition into the Upper Yellowstone, 1870. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, June.
- GERALD FORBES. History of the Osage Blanket Lease. *Chron. Oklahoma*, Mar.
- DEAN TRICKETT. Civil War in the Indian Territory. *Ibid.*
- CAROLYN THOMAS FOREMAN. General Richard Barnes Mason. *Ibid.*
- Id.* Colonel James B. Many. Commandant at Fort Gibson, Fort Towson, and Fort Smith [1824-25]. *Ibid.*, June.
- GRANT FOREMAN. Historical Background of the Kiowa-Comanche Reservation. *Ibid.*
- RICHARD H. HARPER. The Missionary Work of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, in Oklahoma: III, Work among the White People. *Ibid.*
- ELSIE CADY GLEASON. Newspapers of the Panhandle of Oklahoma, 1886-1940. *Ibid.*
- HARRY N. M. WINTON. A Pacific Northwest Bibliography, 1940. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, Apr.
- W. L. DAVIS. Peter John De Smet: The Years of Preparation, 1801-1837. *Ibid.*
- RAY LYMAN WILBUR. Our Pacific Destiny. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, June.
- DOROTHY O. JOHANSEN. The Oregon Steamship Navigation Company: An Example of Capitalism on the Frontier. *Ibid.*
- ELLA M. REA. Ordeal of a Klickitat Family under Klickitat Mores. *Oregon Hist. Quar.*, June.
- CHESTER ANDERS FEE. Oregon's Historical Esperanto: The Chinook Jargon. *Ibid.*
- JONAS A. JONASSON. Local Road Legislation in Early Oregon. *Ibid.*
- ALICE HENSON ERNST. Stage Annals of Early Oregon from 1846 to 1875. *Ibid.*
- J. F. SANTEE. History of Christian College at Monmouth. *Ibid.*

## DOCUMENTS

- Whig Convention, Columbus, Ohio, 1840: Letter of John M. Woodbridge. *Ohio State Archaeol. and Hist. Quar.*, Apr.
- BENJAMIN F. THOMAS. Off to the War [diary, 1861]. *Palimpsest*, June.
- Correspondence of Robert Campbell, 1834-1845. *Missouri Hist. Soc. Glimpses of the Past*, Jan.
- JAMES D. MORRISON. Notes from the *Northern Standard*, 1842-1849. *Chron. Oklahoma*, Mar.
- RICHARD R. STENBERG. Polk and California: Additional Documents. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, June.
- T. C. ELLIOTT. Bodega to Clayoquot in 1790 in a Long Boat. *Oregon Hist. Quar.*, June.

## LATIN-AMERICAN HISTORY

J. W. Caughey

## ARTICLES

- CARL O. SAUER. The Personality of Mexico. *Geograph. Rev.*, July.
- SILVESTRE TERRAZAS. Los primeros blancos al norte de la Nueva España. *Bol. Soc. Chihuahuense Est. Hist.*, Jan.
- BARBARA BOSTON. The "De Soto Map". *Mid-America*, July.
- ALEXANDER MARCHANT. Colonial Brazil as a Way Station for the Portuguese India Fleets. *Geograph. Rev.*, July.
- ROBERT C. WEST and JAMES J. PARSONS. The Topia Road: A Trans-Sierran Trail of Colonial Mexico. *Ibid.*
- ERNESTO RESTREPO TIRADO. Documentos del Archivo de Indias [summary of contents of legajos 589-618, sección de justicia]. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Jan.
- Indice de reales cédulas y breves pontificios que reposan en el Archivo Arzobispal de Bogotá. *Ibid.*, Mar.
- GUSTAVO OTERO MUÑOZ. Historia de la historiografía colombiana. *Ibid.*
- ALBERTO TERRAZAS VALDEZ. Fundación de la misión de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Paso del Norte. *Bol. Soc. Chihuahuense Est. Hist.*, Jan.
- DONALD E. WORCESTER. Early Spanish Accounts of the Apache Indians. *Am. Anthropologist*, Apr.
- Catálogo de los grabados antiguos en la exposición de noviembre de 1940, instalada en el Salón de Historia y Bellas Artes del Museo Nacional. *An. Soc. Geog. Hist.*, Mar.
- EMILIO ALVAREZ LEJARZA. Belice es tierra de Guatemala. *Ibid.*
- JUAN CRISÓSTOMO GARCÍA. El palacio arzobispal de Bogotá. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Jan.
- AGUSTIN MALARES CARLO. El siglo xviii español y las colecciones diplomáticas. *Filosofía y Letras*, Apr.
- JOSÉ BELTRAMI. La causa de beatificación del venerable Hermano Pedro. *Rev. Arch. Nac.* (Costa Rica), May.
- ALEXANDER MARCHANT. Tiradentes in the Conspiracy of Minas. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, May.
- J. ANTONIO VILLACORTA C. Guatemala en las Cortes de Cádiz. *An. Soc. Geog. Hist.*, Mar.
- CHARLES C. GRIFFIN. La opinión pública norteamericana y la independencia. *Bol. Acad. Nac. Hist.*, Jan.
- WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON. Russia and the Emancipation of Spanish America, 1816-1826. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, May.
- VICENTE LECUNA. La guerra en 1820. *Bol. Acad. Nac. Hist.*, Jan.
- J. ANTONIO VILLACORTA C. El primer centenario de un libro [Stephens, *Incidents of Travel in Central America*]. *An. Soc. Geog. Hist.*, Mar.
- VIRGILIO RODRÍGUEZ BETETA. Descubridores de un mundo nuevo en "El nuevo mundo" [Stephens, *Incidents of Travel in Central America*]. *Ibid.*
- VITO ALESSIO ROBLES. Los niños héroes representan a todo el país en la epopeya de 1847. *Bol. Soc. Chihuahuense Est. Hist.*, Jan.
- VICENTE LECUNA. Memorándum sobre alteraciones de documentos en las obras de Blanco y Azpurua y de O'Leary. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Mar.

- LOUIS MARTIN SEARS. Frederick Douglass and the Mission to Haiti, 1889-1891. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, May.
- BELISARIO MATOS HURTADO. Antecedentes de la ley 25 de 1892, por la cual se declara día de fiesta nacional el 12 de octubre. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Jan.
- RAYMOND E. CRIST and CARLOS E. CHARDON. Changing Patterns of Land Use in the Valencia Lake Basin of Venezuela. *Geograph. Rev.*, July.
- ALBERTO URBANEJA. El libertador atacado en España. *Bol. Acad. Nac. Hist.*, Jan.
- PRESTON E. JAMES. Expanding Frontiers of Settlement in Latin America—A Project for Future Study. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, May.
- CHARLES B. HITCHCOCK. Third General Assembly of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. *Geograph. Rev.*, July.

## DOCUMENTS

- JOSÉ MARÍA PEINADO. Instrucciones para la constitución fundamental de la monarquía española y su gobierno. *An. Soc. Geog. Hist.*, Mar.
- LEWIS HANKE. Simón Bolívar and Neutral Rights. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, May.
- VICENTE LECUNA. La guerra en 1820: Documentos diversos. *Bol. Acad. Nac. Hist.*, Jan.
- ALBERTO M. CANDIOTI. Una comunicación del Libertador Bolívar sobre los asuntos de Guayaquil, con relación a tres documentos del Protector San Martín. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Jan.
- JOSÉ RESTREPO POSADA. El doctor Nicolás Cuervo y nuestras primeras relaciones con la Santa Sede. *Ibid.*, Mar.
- Carillo y los límites con Panamá [1841]. *Rev. Arch. Nac.* (Costa Rica), May.
- BRAULIO CARRILLO. Exposición al supremo gobierno de Costa Rica desde la ciudad de Guayaquil [1842]. *Ibid.*

## HISTORICAL NEWS

This issue of the *Review* was in press when the present Managing Editor took office on September 1.

### AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting will be held at the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, on December 29, 30, and 31. The usual luncheon and dinner conferences will be provided for, and joint sessions with affiliated societies have been arranged. The Program Committee has endeavored to prepare a program which will give representation to all periods of history, to all major fields of interest, and to the principal regions that have engaged the study of American historians. In view of the difficulties that beset the study of history in Europe at this time, a particular responsibility rests upon the Association. There is at present in the United States a large number of scholars from abroad, and both they and their fellow historians of this country need the stimulus of common association. There is an increased need for co-operation among scholars in different areas of the Western Hemisphere. The study of history in the United States appears to be entering upon a new phase that makes imperative a careful examination of present-day trends, problems, and responsibilities. The Program Committee of the Association has made arrangements for sessions on the following subjects: the Dura excavations; Roman law and institutions in the fifth century; the medieval background of current political problems in the Balkan peninsula; industrial slavery; the age of the Renaissance; Europe's early outlook upon America, 1490-1630; English life and thought about 1600; the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century; the American Revolution; English politics in the eighteenth century; the growth of science and technology since 1750; the industrial revolution; Italy in transition; Western influences in the Balkan peninsula, 1830-1914; England in the 1840's; Chinese ideas of the Western barbarians *ca.* 1850; economic promotion in Latin America during the nineteenth century; business enterprise in the American West, 1815-60; the morale of the Russian army during the World War; the entry of the United States into war, 1917; the King-Crane Commission—an American experiment in peacemaking; peace treaties; nationalism in the British Empire; trends in modern imperialism; do the Americas have a common history?; the study of local history; the selection of candidates for the Ph. D. degree and the placement situation; the historian and the present-day conflict of ideas; the integration of European history and American history; history and the news. Twelve affiliated societies have selected subjects for joint sessions, as follows: the Agricultural History Society—agricultural frontiers in the United States; the American Association for State and

Local History—the function of a historical society; the American Catholic Historical Association—church and state in Latin America; the American Economic History Association—economic controls in wartime; the American Military Institute—naval history and policy since 1914; the American Society of Church History—the church between wars; the Business Historical Society—capitalism: concepts and history; the History of Science Society—history of disease and demography; the Mississippi Valley Historical Association—Frederick Jackson Turner; the National Council for the Social Studies—the teaching of history; the Southern Historical Association—the Republican party in the South. The Society of American Archivists will also hold a joint meeting.

Following established precedent, the *American Historical Review* will publish as a supplement to its April, 1942, issue a *List of Doctoral Dissertations in History Now in Progress at Universities in the United States and the Dominion of Canada, with an Appendix of Other Research Projects in History Now in Progress in the United States and in Canada*. Blank forms for the necessary data to compile these lists will be mailed as heretofore to the heads of history departments of all universities and colleges in the United States and Canada who contributed to the compilation of last year's list. But it is to be feared that those research workers in history who have no present academic connections will be missed. The Executive Secretary of the Association, who is in charge of the compilation of these lists, requests that all research students pursuing definite projects of research in history transmit a report of their projects to him at Study Room 274, Library of Congress Annex, Washington, D. C. The report should contain (1) a brief title of the project (not more than eight words); (2) a statement of how long ago the project was started; (3) approximately how soon it will be completed; and (4) how long it is likely to be in terms of octavo pages. It is understood, of course, that all figures are approximate. Contributors will please print out carefully the titles of their projects. A great deal of time was wasted last year in deciphering illegible returns. Contributors are also requested to indicate precisely where in time and where in place their project belongs and to indicate their institutional connections if they care to have them recorded. Since the time for editing and printing is necessarily short, no returns can be included in the lists for 1941 which are not in the hands of the Executive Secretary by January 15, 1942.

Due to the fact that the annual subvention of \$300, which the Carnegie Institution of Washington had been paying to the Association to meet the expense of editing and publishing the annual list of doctoral dissertations in history now in progress, will not be renewed for the year 1941, the Executive Committee of the Association has voted that a charge of fifty cents per entry shall hereafter be made for all notices listed in it. Those sending in entries for the *List* should, therefore, include fifty cents to cover each entry. If, for any reason, the entry is rejected, the fifty cents will be refunded.



## OTHER HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: one box of typewritten transcripts of records of the Manor of Marcle Audleys (Hellens, Much Marcle, Herefordshire, England), mainly fifteenth to seventeenth century; forty documents pertaining to the book trade of the Brotherhood of St. John the Apostle in Seville, Spain, 1636 to 1756; photostats of fourteen documents mainly pertaining to lands of the Eastern Shore of Maryland, 1666 to 1811; twelve additional reproductions of letters of George Washington, June 16, 1757, to December 13, 1799; five shelves of papers of John C. Fitzpatrick pertaining mainly to George Washington; twenty papers of the Reverend Jacob Bailey (loyalist and first missionary of the Church of England in the Kennebec region), 1760 to 1781; photostats of four papers of Tench Tilghman (including journal and account books), 1775 to 1786; microfilm of 166 papers of the Reed family of Indiana and Kentucky, 1795 to 1891; 2,789 photoprints (photostats and photofilm enlargement prints), 119 pages of transcripts, and 3,883 photofilm pages of manuscripts in Spanish and Mexican archives, additional gift from the Carnegie Institution of Washington; 222 additional pages of typewritten translations of manuscripts in the Papeles de Cuba, Archivo General de Indias, Seville, Spain (reproductions or copies of which are in the possession of the North Carolina Historical Commission); eighteen miscellaneous papers, mainly letters of eminent Americans, 1800 to 1905; eighteen papers relating to Sakakawea, the Bird Woman of the Lewis and Clark Expedition; two volumes of transcriptions and translations of Spanish records of the City of San Antonio, 1815 to 1849; 131 additional papers of José Ignacio Rodríguez, 1824 to 1907; microfilm of "Vestry Proceedings" of Old Durham Church, Grayton, Maryland, 1824 to 1927; logbook kept by Horatio Nelson Cady, midshipman, U.S.N., on U. S. Ship *Hornet*, October 12, 1825, to November 17, 1826; one small box of additional papers of Thomas Ritchie, 1837 to 1853; volume including the constitution, signatures of original members, and minutes of meetings of the Washington Society (literary and debating society), February 12 to April 30, 1838; two volumes of the journal of Jared Leigh Elliott, kept as chaplain on the Wilkes Expedition, August 3, 1838, to May 6, 1842; one box of additional typewritten transcripts of county records of Tennessee, 1826 to 1856; 227 letters of Rufus Mead, jr. (sergeant in 5th Volunteer Regiment of Connecticut), written to members of his family, May 25, 1861, to May 5, 1865; thirteen letters written by William C. McKinley to his wife, December 17, 1861, to May 5, 1862 (Civil War letters); sixty-six boxes of papers of Edward McPherson, members of his family, Thaddeus Stevens, and others (1715 to 1936); microfilm of 739 letters of Theodore Roosevelt, mainly to Anna Roosevelt Cowles (his sister), 1870 to 1919; one roll of additional microfilm of letters

of Theodore Roosevelt which are in the letter books of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, 1889 to 1895; thirteen papers of Silas Weir Mitchell (eleven letters from John Hay, one from Clara Stone Hay, one from Horace Gray), January 10, 1879, to January 31, 1907; fourteen large containers of additional papers of John A. Logan; three boxes of papers of Richmond Pearson Hobson, 1889 to 1937 (additional); seventy-seven pieces additional to the Woodrow Wilson Collection, November 20, 1890, to 1939; typewritten copies, photostats, and newspaper clippings, consisting of correspondence between Rosika Schwimmer and Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, 1930 to 1935 (sixteen pieces); forty-five boxes of additional papers relating to Robert Green Ingersoll, 1895 to 1936; fifty-six boxes of papers and metal cuts (for cartoons, etc.) of the National Woman's Party, 1913 to 1920 (additional); one box of papers of Edith Benham Helm pertaining to the Paris Peace Conference, 1918 to 1919.

The National Archives has announced the establishment by an act of Congress approved on July 9, 1941, of a National Archives Trust Fund Board, with authority to accept and administer gifts or bequests of money, securities, and other personal property "for the benefit of or in connection with The National Archives, its collections, or its services". The Board consists of the Archivist of the United States, as Chairman, and the chairmen of the Senate and House Library Committees. The demands of the national emergency for office space and for better servicing of noncurrent Federal records are in large part responsible for several transfers, recently completed or in progress, of large bodies of material to the National Archives. Among these are the main body of records of the Office of the Quartermaster General through 1914, most of the noncurrent records of the Office of the Chief of Ordnance, the general correspondence files of the Navy Department's Bureau of Navigation through 1924 and of its Bureau of Supplies and Accounts through 1939, and the administrative correspondence and case files of the General Land Office through 1908. Other recent transfers of special interest include twenty-one volumes of correspondence, reports, essays, and other papers, 1839-60, of the former Agricultural Division of the Patent Office, the predecessor of the Department of Agriculture; field notes, maps and profiles, and other records of the Intercontinental Railway Commission, which conducted surveys in Central and South America in the nineties; records of the Committee on Economic Security, 1934-35; and records of the Temporary National Economic Committee, 1938-41. The first of the inventories of material in the National Archives to be issued since the initiation of the new finding-mediums program is entitled *Preliminary Inventory of the War Industries Board Records* (pp. xvii, 134). Other new processed professional documents include bibliographies on the arrangement and description of archival material (pp. 7) and on the conservation of cultural resources in times of war (pp. 9), and

*Staff Information Circular* No. 11, entitled "The Role of Records in Administration", which consists of discussions on German administration, by Ernst Posner, on American Federal government administration, by Helen L. Chatfield, and on American business administration, by Edna B. Poeppel. Copies of any of these documents are available upon request as long as the supply lasts, and a mailing list for future issues of the *Staff Information Circulars* is being established. Gaston L. Litton, assistant archivist in the Division of Interior Department Archives of the National Archives, has been granted leave of absence for one year to serve as librarian of the National University of Panama.

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Library was formally dedicated to the service of the nation by the President of the United States at Hyde Park on June 30. Frank C. Walker, Postmaster General of the United States, presided, and President Roosevelt's dedicatory remarks were preceded by short addresses by R. D. W. Connor, Archivist of the United States, and Samuel E. Morison, professor of history at Harvard University. The President announced the appointment of Basil O'Connor, Frank C. Walker, Harry L. Hopkins, and Samuel E. Morison as members of the Board of Trustees, which is authorized by law to accept gifts and bequests of personal property and to hold and administer them and the fees collected from visitors to the exhibition rooms as trust funds for the benefit of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library. The Archivist of the United States serves as Chairman of the Board, the Secretary of the Treasury is also a member ex officio, and one member is still to be appointed. The museum portions of the library were opened to the public after the dedication exercises, and within three weeks over six thousand visitors had paid the admission fee of twenty-five cents. No fees will be charged for the use of the library proper when it is opened. Material recently received by the library from the President includes stenographic reports of his press conferences from 1933 to 1940, a collection of pamphlets and other printed material pertaining chiefly to the United States Navy in the nineteenth century, and additional files of presidential papers. Dr. John S. Curtiss, formerly an area project supervisor of the Historical Records Survey in New York and an instructor in history in several municipal colleges in New York City, has been appointed an assistant archivist at the library. A six-page illustrated circular describing the library has recently been published as National Archives Circular No. 5; copies can be obtained from the library or from the administrative secretary of the National Archives.

The Middle States Association of History and Social Science Teachers has published as Volume 38, Number 2, of its *Proceedings* a *Guide to Ten Major Depositories of Manuscript Collections in New York State*, compiled by the Historical Records Survey and edited by Harry B. Yoshpe.

The *Guide* covers the New York State Library at Albany and nine other important institutions distributed geographically from the Hudson and Champlain valleys in the east to Buffalo in the west. It does not include manuscript collections in New York City. Separate copies of the *Guide* are priced at one dollar, but members of the Middle States Association receive copies without charge.

Several of the symposia held at the University of Chicago in the week beginning September 22 as part of the university's semicentennial celebration were historical in character. Among the historians who participated were Louis Gottschalk, Wilbur K. Jordan, Charles H. McIlwain, Loren C. MacKinney, John U. Nef, Albert T. Olmstead, Michael I. Rostovtzeff, Pernadotte E. Schmitt, Stuart R. Tompkins, and William L. Westermann.

The Social Science Research Council has awarded the following grants-in-aid in the historical field: J. Cutler Andrews, Carnegie Institute of Technology, newsgathering during the American Civil War, 1861-65; Karl J. R. Arndt, Louisiana State University, the Harmony Society; Manoel S. Cardozo, Catholic University of America, mining in colonial Brazil; Louise Burnham Dunbar, University of Illinois, British royal governors in North America during the French and Indian War; Courtney Robert Hall, Adelphi College, American military medicine; Lawrence A. Harper, University of California, English and colonial mercantilism (renewal); Abraham L. Harris, Howard University, Werner Sombart and the roots of national (German) socialism; Albert Virgil House, jr., Wilson Teachers College, rice plantation management in ante-bellum Georgia; Naum Jasny, Washington, D. C., the grains in the classical world; Merrill Jensen, University of Washington, the United States during the Confederation Period, 1781-89; Vernon H. Jensen, University of Colorado, labor in lumbering; John Tate Lanning, Duke University, the political agencies of medicine in the Spanish colonies, 1535-1821; Guy Anderson Lee, Clark University, the Chicago grain elevator industry; James C. Malin, University of Kansas, the adaptation of farm population and agriculture to prairie and plains environment; Arthur J. Marder, Harvard University, British sea power in the dreadnought era; Leon Soutierre Marshall, Westminster College, the cultural evolution of the first industrial city, Manchester, 1780-1850; Thomas Corwin Mendenhall, Yale University, the dispatches of J. F. Schlezer, Brandenburg envoy to England, 1655-60; Horace Cornelious Peterson, University of Oklahoma, public opinion in wartime, 1917-18; Calvin F. Schmid, University of Washington, political movements in the state of Minnesota; Robert Sidney Smith, Duke University, Spanish-American trade in the eighteenth century, with particular reference to merchant guilds (consulados); Bell Irvin Wiley, University of Mississippi, the everyday life of the Confederate soldier; Oscar Osburn Winther, Indiana University, fron-

tier transportation in the Pacific Northwest, 1792-1883; Edgar Zilsel, International Institute of Social Research, society, technology, and economy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (renewal). Southern grants-in-aid are: F. Garvin Davenport, Transylvania College, cultural life in Kentucky, 1800-60; James Linus Glanville, Southern Methodist University, Italian imperialism (*Mare Nostrum*), 1897-1914; Ora Almon Hilton, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, public opinion in the United States during the World War, 1917-18; Marian D. Irish, Florida State College, the Southern labor movement, 1930-40; Weymouth Tyree Jordan, Judson College, pre-Civil War plantation practices in Alabama (renewal); Chase Curran Mooney, Brenau College, the institution of slavery in Tennessee; Joseph Howard Parks, Teachers College, Memphis, Tennessee, the life of John Bell, with special reference to the origin and development of the Whig party in Tennessee; Benjamin Arthur Quarles, Dillard University, the career of Frederick Douglass, the Negro abolitionist; Daniel Merritt Robison, Vanderbilt University, the Whig tradition in the Solid South. A postdoctoral fellowship was awarded to M. Margaret Ball, Wellesley College, for training in international relations with special reference to the foreign policies of South American republics. The predoctoral field fellowships are: William Baker Bristol, University of Pennsylvania, social and economic conditions influencing certain aspects of international relations of the southern South American republics; Joseph Thistle Lambie, Harvard University, the Norfolk and Western Railway and its influence on the development of the transportation of soft coal; Jacob Loft, Columbia University, labor in the printing industry in the twentieth century.

The Ecuadorian Institute of Amazonian Studies announces a competition in celebration of the fourth centennial of the discovery of the Amazon River. Scholars are invited to contribute monographs on the discovery and colonization of the Amazon. The contest will close on January 15; a first prize of \$1,000 and a second prize of a gold medal will be awarded. Directions as to the prescribed form for bibliographies and further particulars may be secured by writing to the Secretary of the Ecuadorian Institute of Amazonian Studies, Apartado 513, Quito, Ecuador.

#### PERSONAL

The Reverend Father Hippolyte Delehay, S. J., died in Belgium on April 1 at the age of eighty-two. He was without doubt one of the most learned Belgians of his day. As a member of the Bollandists he spent most of his life carrying on the distinguished tradition handed down from Bollandus, Papebroch, and the other seventeenth century Jesuits who founded the society. Like them, though even more rigorously and scientifically trained, he edited sections of the *Acta sanctorum* and contributed

frequently to learned journals of many sorts. In particular he was a regular contributor to the *Analecta Bollandiana*, where his scholarly methods in no sense disguised the charm of his humanist's Latin style or the breadth and vigor of his thought. Of his many works probably the best known as well as the most useful for the historian at large is his *Work of the Bollandists through the Centuries*, published in English in 1922.

Few of the widely dispersed friends of Augustus Hunt Shearer were prepared for the Associated Press dispatch announcing his death at his home in Buffalo, New York, on May 31. Born in Philadelphia on February 21, 1878, he prepared for college at the Penn Charter School and proceeded to Rutgers College and then to Harvard. From each of these latter he received three degrees, including that of Ph.D. from Harvard in 1903 and that of Litt.D. from Rutgers in 1934; he was not without honor in his academic homeland. After teaching history for relatively short periods at Trinity College (Hartford), Dartmouth College, and Hamilton College, in all of which he left a definite impression of scholarship, culture, and agreeable personality, he turned to the library field, going to the Newberry Library in Chicago, where he remained from 1912 to 1917. His interest in history and in teaching never flagged, and during most of his library career he devoted part of his time to teaching history, as when in 1916-17 he gave courses at Northwestern University. This was true at Buffalo, where his most distinctive contributions to and through the library were made as librarian of Grosvenor Library from 1917 and director of the library science course at the University of Buffalo from 1920. Thus Dr. Shearer was admirably equipped by his training and experience for the important role of liaison officer between history and the library, and his work as such, though staged in less conspicuous environments, should be remembered with that of Winsor, Burr, and Jameson, although in his modesty he would have been shocked by even this indirect comparison. His affection for his alma mater led to his *Little Book of Rutgers Tales* (1905), but most of his work was in the compilation of historical materials and various forms of editorial activity of value to historical scholarship. He assembled and edited most of the material on "Collections" in *A Guide to Historical Literature* (1931), of which he was one of the five joint editors. Dr. Shearer's career was featured in the local press at the time of his death by long articles and leading editorials testifying to the remarkable nature of his contributions to his combined professional fields and to the entire cultural life of Buffalo, especially through the development of Grosvenor Library.

André Wilmart died in Paris early in the summer. He was one of the most productive scholars in the field of medieval Latin literature and medieval thought and leaves behind him hundreds of articles and many books of outstanding merit and distinction. Wilmart was born at Orléans

on January 28, 1876, and at an early age followed courses at the Sorbonne. Later he sat under the great Louis Havet at the École des Hautes Études, where he learned that rigorous method and exhaustive investigation are the basis of solid scholarship. He was trained also at the Seminary St. Sulpice at Paris and in 1899 received the Benedictine habit at Solesmes. During the troubles over secularization of church property in France he fled to the Isle of Wight, where he remained until his transfer to the abbey at Farnborough in 1906. He was well known and admired on the Continent and in America for the excellence and range of his scholarship, to which tribute was paid when the Vatican authorities commissioned him to catalogue the library of Queen Christina. In 1933 he published the *Analecta reginensia* and in 1937, the first volume of the *Codices reginenses Latini*. Among his other outstanding books are *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du moyen âge latin: Études d'histoire littéraire* (Paris, 1932) and editions of Guigues du Chastel's *Meditationes* (Paris, 1936) and John de Trastevere's *De vera pace* (1938). The first section of his study of the "Florilège mixte de Thomas Bekynton" has recently appeared in *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, I, no. 1 (1941). The invasion of France barred the way to his return to his English abbey and forced him to remain in Paris.

The most widely known archaeologist of our time, Sir Arthur Evans, died on July 11 at Oxford. The son of Sir John Evans, who was himself a distinguished archaeologist, he was born in England on July 8, 1851, at Nash Mills, Herts. He was educated at Harrow and then at Oxford and Göttingen. After early adventure of another kind he made his reputation as a student of Aegean archaeology, particularly as a result of his excavations at Cnossus, near Candia in Crete. There he uncovered the great palace of the Bronze Age and traced the history of the site, revealing the existence of an Aegean civilization on a par with those of contemporary Egypt and Mesopotamia. The very name Minoan, by which the Cretan civilization of the Bronze Age is now designated, was first suggested by Sir Arthur Evans. Besides many articles on various aspects of Aegean civilization he has published the following books: *Cretan Pictographs and Prae-Phoenician Script* (1895), *Scripta Minoa* (1909), *The Shaft Graves and Beehive Tombs of Mycenae and their Interrelation* (1929), *The Earlier Religion of Greece in the Light of Cretan Discoveries* (1931), and *The Palace of Minos* (4 vols., 1922-35).

James F. Hines, whose death occurred on July 12, was born near Kewanna, Indiana, on March 3, 1875. In 1901 he was graduated from the Indiana State Normal School, and for the next four years he was superintendent of schools at Akron, Indiana. He spent the year 1905-1906 as a student at Indiana University and then became superintendent of schools



at Roann, Indiana. In 1908 he entered the University of Notre Dame and two years later received the degree of bachelor of philosophy. He became a member of the history faculty of Notre Dame in the fall of 1910 and remained at the university until his retirement in 1938. His special fields were ancient Greece and Rome. He was widely read in medieval English history also and as a hobby became deeply immersed in the study of Shakespeare. In his long academic career Professor Hines published little, but he is remembered by his students as an enthusiastic teacher whose long hours of research in the library were a source of inspiration to everybody at the university.

Edgar Rubey Harlan, curator of the Iowa State Historical, Memorial, and Art Department from 1909 to 1937, died at his home in Des Moines on July 13. Born at Spartansburg, Indiana, on February 28, 1869, he came with his Quaker parents to Keosauqua, Iowa, at the age of four. In 1896 he received his LL.B. from Drake University and in the following year returned to Keosauqua, where he married and practiced law. He was the prosecuting attorney of Van Buren County from 1898 to 1902. In 1907, however, his interest in local history led him to the position of assistant curator of the State Historical Department, where, after the death of the founder, Charles Aldrich, he was made curator, and he served in that capacity for twenty-eight years. Indefatigable in the collection of historical relics, newspapers, books, pamphlets, and the personal papers and portraits of notable Iowans, Mr. Harlan greatly expanded the resources of his institution. In addition to gathering source materials he edited the *Annals of Iowa*, wrote *A Narrative History of the People of Iowa* (1931), which fills five volumes, established the location of many historic sites, and preserved much of the tribal lore of the Meskwaki Indians. His intimate knowledge of local history made his services on various memorial committees invaluable.

Clarence Stanley Fisher died in Jerusalem on July 20 at the age of sixty-five. A native of Philadelphia and a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania (1897), he began his archaeological career in 1898 as architect of the first American expedition ever to excavate in Babylonia, that sent by his alma mater to Nippur. The remainder of his life was devoted to archaeology, and he was at various times associated with nearly all the American institutions excavating in the Near East, notably the University of Pennsylvania, Harvard University, the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, and the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Among the more important sites associated with his activities are Nippur, Samaria, Memphis, Megiddo, and Ezion-Geber. Since 1926 he had been professor of archaeology in the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem and at the time of his death was acting director of the school. Although primarily an

architect, whose beautiful plans are found in many excavation reports, in his later years he devoted much attention to pottery. Three volumes of his great corpus of Palestinian pottery, arranged by form, decoration, and date, have been published. It is hoped that the final volume is in shape for the printer.

The General Education Board has announced the appointment of Eugene E. Pfaff, Associate Professor, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, to a fellowship at Teachers College, Columbia University, for the current academic year. Dr. Pfaff is one of four representatives of liberal arts colleges selected from the thirty-four institutions participating in the co-operative study on teacher education sponsored by the American Council on Education.

E. Wilson Lyon, chairman of the department of history at Colgate University, has been elected president of Pomona College, Claremont, California, assuming his new duties this month.

Ollinger Crenshaw has been promoted to the rank of associate professor of history at Washington and Lee University.

The following appointments are noted: *University of Michigan*, Robert H. McDowell, formerly research associate in archaeology there, and William B. Willcox of Williams College as assistant professors; *Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College*, Berlin B. Chapman of the Fairmont West Virginia State Teachers College as assistant professor; *Pennsylvania State College*, Philip S. Klein of Franklin and Marshall College as assistant professor.